

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith the full text of the announcement of the American Medical Association on the contribution it is making to the medical schools.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; and

H. R. 2365. An act for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1772. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$861,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1773. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the thirty-second annual national convention of the American Legion, held at Los Angeles, Calif., October 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1950, pursuant to Public Law No. 249, Seventy-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 3180. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 878. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9853, a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia; without amendment (Rept. No. 3181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. Senate Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period cer-

tain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 3182). Ordered to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 9888. A bill for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 9889. A bill for the relief of Ivan Norman Genit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee: Lest we lost our footing and our way in all the terror and tragedy of these testing days, we turn from the din of earth's shouting and tumult to this noontide altar of Thy grace. Through the tangled wilderness of human relations, show us the clear path of Thy will for our troubled day. In the dense darkness, black as the pit from pole to pole, be to us as a pillar of cloud and of fire. In the confusion of tongues and councils, endue us with the wisdom to rightly discern the signs of the times. This day, keep our tongues from evil and our lips from speaking guile, so that no careless word of ours may smite or hurt the spirit of another by our side. So may we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee, our God. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 8, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAYBANK was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is equally divided after a quorum call, and the unanimous-consent agreement seems to contemplate a mandatory quorum call.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HILL. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, some business has already been transacted before we have had a quorum call. I therefore ask that the time thus consumed be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time does not begin to run until after a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. In that case I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the acting majority leader. What will happen in the event the motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is agreed to? Is it the intention of the Senators who are in charge of the bill to press for an immediate vote on the bill, or will the bill be open to further amendment?

Mr. HILL. Under the rules of the Senate, the bill would be open to further amendment. However, it is our intention to try to get a vote on the bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it would clarify the situation if immediately after the quorum call the acting majority leader would make a statement to that effect. Under the form of the two unanimous-consent agreements entered into we are faced with a rather complicated situation, because no time is stated when a final vote on the railway-labor bill is to be had. Does the Senator see what I mean?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I think such a statement should be made, so that we may be able to vote immediately on the bill if the Senate desires to do so.

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Long
Anderson	Gillette	Lucas
Brewster	Gurney	McCarran
Bricker	Hayden	McCarthy
Bridges	Hendrickson	McClellan
Butler	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Byrd	Hill	McKellar
Cain	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Hunt	Magnuson
Carlson	Ives	Malone
Chavez	Jenner	Martin
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Donnell	Kefauver	Murray
Douglas	Kerr	Neely
Dworshak	Kilgore	Nixon
Eaton	Knowland	O'Connor
Ellender	Langer	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Leahy	Pepper
Frear	Lehman	Robertson
Fulbright		Russell

Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Smith, N. C.
Stennis

Taft
Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tobey

Watkins
Wherry
Wiley
Williams
Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with reference to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I beg to say that under the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at last Friday the Senate will, at 1 o'clock p. m., proceed to vote on the so-called Holland amendment. Following the vote on the Holland amendment, the Senate will immediately proceed to consider the so-called Jenner amendment. On that amendment the junior Senator from Indiana has 15 minutes, if he desires to use that much time, and Senators who oppose the amendment have 15 minutes, if they desire to use that much time. Then a motion will be made to lay the Jenner amendment on the table.

Shortly after disposition of the Jenner amendment, we hope to take final action on the union-shop bill, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act, which is the unfinished business, so as to leave as much time as possible between final action on that bill and 4 o'clock, when, under the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at last Friday, the Senate will proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate pro-

vided, on the bill providing aid for Yugoslavia. Of course, if we do not complete action on the union-shop bill at 4 o'clock, the Senate will return to the bill providing aid for Yugoslavia, and after action on that bill has been completed, the Senate will return to the union-shop bill.

Mr. President, how much time is left for the proponents and opponents of the union-shop bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-five minutes, which is equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we have heard it said that an old jurist was one time the recipient of a complaint by someone who protested about the volume of the law. This old jurist said:

It is not the great volume of the law which raises such difficulties; it is the voluminousness of the commentaries about it.

And so with respect to the pending proposal. It is not the subject itself which is confusing, it is the irrelevancies which have been injected into it which make it appear there is some confusion about it if, indeed, there is any element of confusion existing at all.

Mr. President, as I see it, the matter before us is very simple. By the passage of a bill in 1926, and by its amendment in 1934, we have a Railway Labor Act. That act has always segregated legislation dealing with railway management-labor relationships. While air carriers and some other small sections of transportation are included within the act, it has primarily been legislation dealing with management-labor relations in the railway industry.

For reasons which the Congress at the time deemed adequate, there was denied to railway labor the privilege of having a union shop. Therefore, Mr. President, the question arises: Does the Congress desire to retain that limitation and deny to railway labor the right by collective bargaining with management to provide for the union shop? The bill which is now before the Senate would change that prohibition and permit collective-bargaining agreement between railway management and labor providing for the union shop.

Mr. President, and my colleagues, we all realize the reasons why that should be done. Congress has specifically recognized the same right in the case of labor generally. Under laws heretofore enacted the union shop has been specifically permitted in other fields of labor. That was done in 1947, and it was carried over in the enactment of Congress in 1949.

That is not the question here. But my distinguished colleague from Florida says that we should also attach a condition and limitation whereby management and labor by collective bargaining would not be allowed to enter into an agreement for the union shop in States which by their constitutions or statutes forbid the union shop. One of those States is our great State of Florida.

Mr. President, I say that merely because such a provision is in the Taft-

Hartley law does not mean that we should adopt the Holland amendment and attach that condition to the bill which is now pending before the Senate, and there are several very clear reasons why the amendment should not be adopted.

In the first place the Taft-Hartley law applies to a very much larger field of management-labor relationships than is covered by the pending bill, which solely affects railway labor. As will be seen by an examination of page 3 of the Taft-Hartley law, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, it applies where "commerce is affected." That means all interstate transportation, not merely railway labor, but all interstate transportation. It also applies to all that vast category of industries covered by the phrase "affecting commerce." We know that that reaches down to a point where a very narrow margin divides what is intrastate and what is interstate commerce, when the broadest possible language, "affecting commerce," is used. In fact, Congress has been reluctant to use the language, "affecting commerce," which constitutes the utmost of its jurisdiction in the field of commerce among the States and with foreign countries.

So, Mr. President, the Taft-Hartley law touches almost the entire field of management-labor relations. It covers an innumerable list of industries and activities, whereas the pending bill affects only railway labor, a distinct segment of interstate commerce. That is the first distinction.

The second distinction is that in dealing with railway labor the Labor Board and the courts have held that it is necessary to bargain with all of a craft of a given character throughout a single carrier's jurisdiction. The particular Board decision to which I refer is found in the volume entitled "Determinations of Craft or Class of the National Mediation Board." This is case No. R-690, decided on May 27, 1941. I read from page 209:

The Board does not undertake to discuss the relative advantages or disadvantages which may inhere in single or divided representation, respectively. Doubtless serious arguments may be made both for and against each method. The act leaves the Board in no doubt that Congress had in mind single representation for each craft or class on each carrier when enacting it; and that had the Congress thought of subdivisions of a craft or class or of a carrier as desirable methods of representation it would have made provision for their use.

Finally, the Board concludes as a matter of law that the Railway Labor Act vests the Board with no discretion to split a single carrier or combine two or more carriers for the purpose of determining who shall be eligible to vote for a representative of a craft or class of employees under section 2, ninth, of the act, and the argument that it has such power fails to furnish any basis of law for such administrative discretion.

In the case of Switchmen's Union versus Board, that decision of the Railway Labor Board was affirmed. On page 309 of Three Hundred and Twenty-eighth United States Reports, where the decision of that case appears, we find the language of Mr. Justice Reed, who states that the Court refused to interfere with that specific finding of the Board,

namely, that in the railway industry all employees of a given railroad, for example, in a given craft must be dealt with collectively in collective-bargaining agreements.

So I say that the analogy that we should impose the limitation that the Congress cannot enact legislation contrary to that of a State—which limitation is contained in the Taft-Hartley law—is inapplicable to the pending bill, first, because in this case we are dealing only with railway labor, which is engaged in interstate commerce. The Taft-Hartley law is dealing with interstate commerce as a whole and with industries and activities and employees "affecting commerce." So the Taft-Hartley law affects interstate commerce on a vastly broader scale than does the measure now before the Senate.

Because there are many cases in which there is doubt as to whether the State or the Federal Government should have jurisdiction, it was proper for the Congress to provide that in connection with the Taft-Hartley Act the limitations of a State prohibition would apply. However, the pending measure is narrower than the Taft-Hartley law, and the analogy is not applicable.

Secondly, in connection with the pending measure, under the decisions of the Board, affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, the management of a given railroad—for example, the Atlantic Coast Line—has to bargain collectively with all employees of a given craft or class in every State where it operates, whereas if the Holland amendment should be adopted, in the State of Florida, for example, a railroad could not deal with all the employees in the same category, because of a prohibition on the part of the State. So that is a difference which does not prevail with respect to the Taft-Hartley law, for in that law there is no provision that management has to deal collectively with all the employees in a given craft, as the United States Supreme Court, in affirming the decision of the Board has held is required by the act of Congress known as the Railway Labor Act.

Third, reason is on the side of not making a distinction in this case, because obviously if a carrier is going to have satisfied labor, it must deal with all of them in the same class alike. It cannot deal with all alike and have one or more States left out and say to those in that State or some other given area, "We are very sorry, but here we cannot give you the same rights that the rest of your workers have, because your State law does not allow you to have those rights."

Mr. President, I am just as zealous in the desire to give full effect to the enactment of my State as is anyone else; but my State does not have the right, nor do the States of other Senators have the right, I say with all deference, to usurp a preeminent constitutional prerogative of the Congress of the United States to legislate when it chooses to do so in the field of interstate commerce. Reason is on the side of having Congress lay down legislation prescribing the rules which will apply in this matter, rules which

similarly will affect all who are similarly situated. That is all this bill purports to do.

Therefore, Mr. President, surely public interest, reason, and logic are on the side of making it impossible for a single State to defeat the conferring of this salutary provision upon an entire class of workers.

Mr. President, I have received a great many letters and communications in regard to this matter. I have received 43 letters and 8 telegrams in support of the bill. I have received 16 letters and 1 telegram in opposition to the bill. It might be interesting for me to read from a letter which comes to me from Mr. R. G. Smith, of St. Augustine, Fla., and the Railway Employees' Department, who says:

This amendment had been discussed with representatives of the carriers during meetings in Washington prior to the introduction of S. 3295. Frankly, we did not anticipate the opposition which is now developing on the question, but instead we had hoped for only token opposition—if any at all.

I call particular attention to this language:

However, the Florida East Coast—

Meaning the Florida East Coast Railroad's management—

passed out a pamphlet edited by the Association of American Railroads entitled "Shall Railroad Workers Be Compelled To Join Unions?" along with pay checks on June 1, 1950. Others will probably do the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me one additional minute?

Mr. HILL. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

So, Mr. President, judging by the letter Mr. Smith has sent to me, railroad management, which is the real opposition to this bill, has been passing out advice in connection with pay checks to railway employees; in that way railroad management has been giving to railroad employees advice as to whether workers should join unions and urging opposition to this measure. By the very language of the bill, railroad labor and management will be permitted to negotiate for a union shop. There is no compulsion in the bill for management and labor to do so. Management will be able amply to protect itself through free, voluntary bargaining on the subject.

So I do hope that the Senate will approve this bill which will enable railroad management and labor freely to bargain collectively for the union shop which is not now permitted by law and which for all practical purposes would not be effective if the Senate were not to adopt the pending bill and pass the Holland amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Florida would deny effect to the bill now before the Senate in those States which either in their constitutions or in their statutes prohibit union-shop agreements and check-offs. This proposal runs in the face of previous Federal action in the field of legislation applying to the railroad industry. In this area the Federal Government has for a long time preempted the field. This is no accident, but stems from the close interrelation, both physical and in the nature of the functions performed, of various segments of our railroad industry. Thus, for a long time the Federal Government has had a special labor-relations act for the railroad industry; the railroad industry was excluded both from the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

The adoption of the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Florida would, in large measure, either make unworkable the provisions of Senate bill 3295 or make its provisions difficult to administer. Here, too, as in the case of other legislation dealing with the railroad industry, the peculiar nature of the activity involved requires many of the employees to cross State lines in the discharge of their duties. Moreover, a dispute in one location of the railroad industry has repercussions that are unmatched in virtually any other industry in this country.

I would emphasize in closing, Mr. President, that it seems to me if we are to make the Taft-Hartley law applicable to the railway industry we should make it applicable in toto, not piecemeal. I speak briefly as a past chairman of a President's Emergency Board, the 1941 Board, which had jurisdiction of a labor dispute involving all the railroads of the country, including both the long and the short lines. On the basis of that experience it would be most unfortunate if we varied from the policy of uniformity in connection with the handling of railroad problems through Federal legislation in connection with the Railway Labor Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. May I have one more minute?

Mr. HILL. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. MORSE. We have set up in Chicago, for example, the Railway Adjustment Board, which again functions on the principle of uniform application of its policies throughout the country. I respectfully submit that if we start making an exception of the Railway Labor Act, as proposed by the amendment of my good friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], we shall soon find that the Railway Labor Act will be so disrupted by great disparities in administrative policies growing out of differences in State laws that the effectiveness of the act will at an early date be greatly impaired. Therefore, I sincerely hope that,

in the interests of keeping the railway labor problems separate and distinct from the application of the Taft-Hartley law, as has been the historic pattern, the Senator's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the question has been raised as to the stand of the railway brotherhoods on this bill. I wish to call the attention of Senators to a telegram sent to each Senator, signed by 25 of the railroad and kindred organizations. The telegram, which is signed by all except one organization, that of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, reads as follows:

We urge that you vote against the amendment offered by Senator HOLLAND for the reason that it would make the bill unworkable and create chaotic conditions in the railway industry, and that it is impractical and impossible of application and administration.

Mr. President, the Senate committee, in reporting this bill unanimously to the Senate, had in mind the paramount consideration of what was best for the public interest, what was the best step to take for the maintenance of industrial peace in the railroad industry, what was best to insure a stable and harmonious management-labor relationship in the railroad industry. Therefore, we reported the bill unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized. He has 17 minutes, if he wishes to use it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that, instead of this bill being, as pictured here, in conformity with what has happened heretofore under legislative policy as determined by the Congress, the bill is a substantial departure from anything which has happened heretofore in the Halls of Congress. The fact is that in 1926, when the railway labor law was enacted, the Congress insisted upon the open-shop provision. When the bill was reenacted in 1934, the Congress again insisted upon retention of the open shop. I am told by the distinguished legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers that this was not only the insistence of Congress but that it was also the unanimous position of the leaders of the operating railroad brotherhoods at that time, both in 1926 and in 1934. I asked that gentleman as to what was the fact as to when any change took place in that thinking. He said that up to the time of the death of Mr. Whitney, which occurred, I believe, something more than a year ago, no change had taken place in his thinking on the open shop. He stated that no change had taken place on this subject in the thinking of Mr. Fraser, the long-time president of the conductors, until the time of his retirement, which was but a few months ago. He stated likewise that no change had taken place up to this time in the thinking of the Brotherhood of Locomotive

Engineers, their legislative representatives and officials.

So, Mr. President, what is designed by this bill is to make a sweeping change in the policy of the Nation as laid down by the acts of Congress affecting railway labor, by placing in the Railway Labor Act, if amended by the pending measure, a provision which for the first time will bring the union-shop principle into that act and into the public policy of the Nation as stated by that act.

Mr. President, it is not surprising that there are Senators who are strongly against my amendment, because they were strongly against a similar provision when it was voted into the Taft-Hartley Act. I call to the attention of the Senate and the public the fact that all three of the distinguished Senators who voiced their opposition to my amendment—and I think there should be added to them the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who likewise, by his brief participation in the debate, indicated his opposition—all three of those who have spoken, and the distinguished chairman, making four in all, were as diametrically opposed to the thinking of the majority of the Congress on this question when the amendment came up to the Taft-Hartley Act. When the question arose as to whether the provision should be removed from the Taft-Hartley Act, as recently as 1949, as the RECORD clearly shows—and there has been inserted into the debate on this bill the vote—all four of the Senators mentioned took exactly the same adverse position with reference to protecting the rights of the States, who had voted anti-closed-shop or anti-union-shop amendments into their constitutions or who had enacted statutes of that kind. Those four Senators took exactly that position in denying, or in seeking to deny, the protection to the States and to the State enactments, at the time of the various debates and votes on the Taft-Hartley Act. I find no fault with the distinguished Senators for continuing their point of view today. They are consistent in the continuance of their point of view, but I would remind the Senate and the country that, as recently as last year, 1949, a large majority of the Senate, not including any of the distinguished Senators who have spoken against my amendment, showed by their vote—the large majority of the Senate amounting to 54 to 41; 53 of the affirmative votes having been actually cast, the other vote having been indicated by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, who could not be present—the Senate, by a vote of 54 to 41, indicated that the Senate still felt it was sound public policy that the protection of the State constitutions and State laws in this field should be preserved in the Taft-Hartley Act. They insisted that that be done. So, Mr. President, we still have the same division.

I may call to the attention of the Senate now, as clearly as I can, the fact that there is no sound reason whatever why the same rule, which is now applicable to motortruck carriers, who

are as much engaged in actual interstate operation as are railroads, and which is applicable to the maritime industries of our Nation, who are engaged almost exclusively in interstate commerce and in foreign commerce—there is no more reason why the rule which is applied to them, and which is applying to them without difficulties under the Taft-Hartley Act without any complaints being made to the Congress, insofar as the junior Senator from Florida has been aware, cannot be made applicable to the railroads and to the aviation industry, which are the only two industries covered by the Railway Labor Act.

So, Mr. President, it is completely futile for anyone to claim or to assert here on the floor of the Senate that a complete denial of the collective bargaining privilege, or a frustration of that privilege, or a serious interference with that privilege, is involved in the adoption of my amendment, which is in the same words as are already included in the Taft-Hartley law. To the contrary, my amendment will merely limit the application of this completely new philosophy, this completely new thinking on the part of the Federal Government, so that the union shop would make its appearance in this field solely in those States and areas which have not proclaimed their thinking as adverse to the union-shop principle, either through their constitutions or through their statutes.

Mr. President, let me remind all Senators that collective bargaining agreements are now in force not only in the two great transportation industries which I have mentioned, namely, the maritime industry and the auto-trucking industry, but also in many other industries which are not directly transportation industries, such as the coal industry, for instance, which do not operate under local bargaining agreements but under industry-wide or regional agreements which give full respect, under the Taft-Hartley law, to the provisions of the constitutions and statutes of the States in banning the closed shop or union shop. The fact is that in the negotiation of those Nation-wide or region-wide agreements under the Taft-Hartley Act they have merely had to make a limitation in the application of the union-shop principle to those States or areas where the union-shop principle can be legally enforced.

Mr. President, no serious question has arisen under that whatsoever. Senators know that is true, so why make a mountain out of a molehill, when there is no mountain here? The real fact is that, if my amendment be agreed to, the Senate of the United States will proclaim that its thinking and philosophy in relation to transportation in the railroad field and in the aviation field are based on exactly the same considerations that apply to the maritime field or the water-transportation field under the Taft-Hartley Act, and to the auto-trucking industry under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. President, we might as well face this question: Is it sound to make a wide difference between industries which are directly competitive? That is what

would be done if my amendment were defeated. We would have the railway industry and its employees, and the aviation industry and its employees, under a completely different and indeed contradictory law from that which prevails as to two other very vital and competing transportation industries, namely, the maritime industry and the auto-trucking industry, and which likewise prevails in many other industries not transportation industries, but in which the collective-bargaining agreements are on a regional or industry-wide basis instead of merely on a local basis.

So, Mr. President, it is a complete fallacy to claim seriously that a hardship would be imposed by the adoption of this amendment. On the contrary, it would require collective bargaining under the amended act to follow the same pattern which already prevails under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Let us open our eyes to the fact that if this amendment is defeated it will be an entering wedge for the defeat of that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which has been found to be salutary and is being followed and is giving protection to the constitutional and statutory enactments of some 18 or 20 States, by which enactments the people of those States have adopted the principle, which is still regarded in those States as good, sound Americanism, that a worker has the right to work, independent of the question of whether he does or does not belong to a union.

Mr. President, that right prevails under the Taft-Hartley Act in 18 or 20 States. If the pending bill shall be enacted so as to break down the provisions of that act, break them down by applying contrary provisions to highly competitive industries competing in those States with industries already under the Taft-Hartley Act, surely it must be clear that such action would be an open invitation to break down and change entirely the policy of the country and of the Congress as applied under the Taft-Hartley Act in this field of union-shop agreements.

Mr. President, there is very little more that I wish to say, except to remind the Senate in these last minutes before we take the vote that the real fact of the matter is that not just the policy of the Senate and not just the policy of the Congress is sought to be changed, but that a very wide change in the thinking and philosophy of the leaders of the operating brotherhoods engaged in the railroad and aviation industries is sought to be applied, and that the people in those brotherhoods are by no means unanimous in their views.

Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD several days some 15 or 20 communications which I have received from a much larger number of reputable citizens in my State, who are members of these brotherhoods, and who spoke of their unyielding opposition to the pending legislation.

Senators will recall that some of those communications spoke of the unyielding opposition of the entire local organization or local membership in some of those unions. In addition to that, we know that the legislative representative

of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers insisted upon having placed in the RECORD a few days ago, by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, in the first instance, and later a different communication by myself, evidence showing that his particular brotherhood, which is one of the most dignified orders and one of the soundest and most reputable orders in this field, does not agree at all with the philosophy of the pending bill, and desires to have its position clearly understood as being opposed to the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is lamentable in the extreme that the leadership of the Senate has seen fit, in these days when we have impending problems so tremendous in their scope that we ought to be spending all our time in attempting to get the soundest solution possible of those problems, when our men are fighting and dying in Korea, when our people continue, as indicated by the mail coming to the office of every Member of the Senate, to reflect a lack of confidence in their national leadership and national policies—it seems to me it was a highly debatable and highly questionable decision to bring legislation of the type of the pending bill to the floor of the Senate, and to consume nearly 3 days in discussing it, when there were other matters which could have been taken up, like the measure brought up last Friday under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Texas, the Yugoslavia-aid bill, which had been ready the day before.

Is it wise to follow such a course when we have no assurance that the House will even consider this pending bill; and, certainly, let me ask, is it wise to consider it when one of the most highly reputable organizations in the whole railway field, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, indicates that it is in unyielding opposition to the proposed legislation, with the contention that without my amendment the bill will be highly destructive of the rights of the members of the brotherhood?

Others have explained that exactly the same situation exists with reference to the Order of Railroad Conductors, although we have no formal or official showing from them to that effect, but instead, they are signers, through their representative, of a letter indicating that with the Hill-Taft amendment in the bill they are willing to swallow this particular legislation.

Mr. President, in closing let me say that we are asked here to make a sweeping change in a Federal public policy which has been applicable since 1926, applied first to one great field, that of railway transportation, and later extended to the aviation industry. We are asked to make this sweeping departure at a time of great confusion and in a time of great emergency.

Mr. President, is that wise, or prudent? Is that an act of prudent leadership? It does not so appeal to me. It seems to me we are asked to make that sweeping change in national policy, we are advised that there is no serious question about it now, that we should make this sweeping change in the policy relating to the railroad brotherhoods which will be accomplished if this bill is enacted,

when in 1926 such a policy was unanimously rejected, in 1934 it was unanimously rejected, and from the best information I have been able to get, namely, from the representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, we are told that no real sentiment for this measure was evident until a little over a year ago, and there is still great division among those who are affected.

Mr. President, the mail which I have received from important members of the brotherhoods in my own State would indicate more clearly than any words the junior Senator from Florida could speak the fact that the thinking is divided and that there are many sound, reputable members of these brotherhoods who want to cling to the policy to which they have attached themselves through all these years—to the policy which they insisted on engrafting into the Railway Labor Act, both when it was enacted in 1926 and when it was reenacted in 1934, and which was preserved there with general consent and approval up until about the time when, without unanimity or accord, this proposal for sweeping change of policy was introduced.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	Nixon
Bridges	Jenner	O'Connor
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Leahy	Smith, N. C.
Donnell	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Dworshak	Lucas	Taylor
Eaton	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Morse	
Hickenlooper		

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it in order to ask that the clerk read the amendment which is now to be voted on? If so, I respectfully ask that the clerk read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the following: "or Territory thereof, or of any State."

On page 2, line 21, to strike out the comma, insert a colon in lieu thereof, and the following: "Provided further, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring

membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The yeas and nays have heretofore been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce further that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—23

Butler	Gillette	Russell
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Carlson	Holland	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Robertson	

NAYS—59

Alken	Ives	Morse
Anderson	Jenner	Mundt
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Bridges	Kefauver	Nixon
Cain	Kem	O'Connor
Capehart	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Clements	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cordon	Langer	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
Gurney	McFarland	Tobey
Hayden	McKellar	Watkins
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hill	Magnuson	Young
Hunt	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—14

Benton	Hoey	Myers
Chapman	Humphrey	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarran	Vandenberg
Green	Maybank	

So Mr. HOLLAND's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is automatically before the Senate. Fifteen minutes' debate on each side is allowed, after which time a motion to table will be in order, if any Senator wishes to make it. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is automatically before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. How much time does the Senator from Indiana have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has 15 minutes, and the opposition has 15 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, through the courtesy of my colleague, and the indulgence of this body, the remarks I had intended to make on the amendment to S. 3295, which I have proposed, were printed in the RECORD of December 7. In those remarks I set forth verbatim the language of the proposed amendment, because each clause, each phrase, each word of the amendment has a specific meaning.

It is not necessary, perhaps, to read the amendment again, but I do wish to state again its main purpose. It is simply to insure, insofar as such a result can be obtained by statute, that in giving to railroad labor unions the enor-

mous increase in power which is granted by S. 3295, we shall not at the same time deliver into their hands, bound hand and foot, without recourse or appeal, those employees of the railroads who happen to have been born Negroes, or of Filipino, Mexican, or Spanish extraction.

S. 3295 undertakes to give congressional approval to contracts between unions and railroads which will require that any man who wants to hold a job on a railroad must become and must remain a member of a union.

But many of the unions upon whom we would thus confer the power to compel railroad workers to become members will not admit Negroes, Filipinos, Mexicans, or Spaniards to membership, or will admit them only to a limited, auxiliary, secondary sort of membership, without real participation in the affairs of the union, or actual influence in the determination of its policies and practices.

In a feeble, half-hearted, wishy-washy attempt to correct such an obvious impossibility as requiring union membership as a condition of continued employment when the unions will not admit certain employees as members, the bill contains certain weasel words, as follows—and it is said that this is the provision which cures all the defects:

Provided, That no such agreement require such condition of employment with respect to employees to whom membership is not available upon the same terms and conditions as are generally applicable to any other member.

In other words, a man must be a member of the union to hold a job, unless the union says that because of his color, his race, his creed, or some other individual characteristic, he will not be accepted into membership.

But that, Mr. President, does not correct the basic injustice of a vicious situation.

It should not be overlooked that S. 3295 proposes an amendment to the Railway Labor Act.

Under that act, the majority of those employed on a railroad in a given craft or class of employment have the right to select the representatives through whom the entire class must bargain collectively with their employers.

To double-rivet this requirement, the railroad companies are forbidden to bargain collectively with any organization or representative other than the one chosen by the majority of the employees of a craft or class.

This majority organization, whatever it may be, is not compelled by the present law to admit minority employees to membership, or to participation in its counsels or the conduct of its affairs.

It follows that such minority employees—and in this connection I have in mind particularly employees of the Negro race, and so forth, who are specifically excluded from membership in many unions—are without any real and effective means of making their views known, of having their influence felt, or even having their rights respected.

Indeed, their rights can be—and their rights have been—bargained away by

representatives whom they did not choose, for or against whom they could not vote, and to whom they had no effective means of remonstrance or protest.

Oh, I know there have been instances in which these disfranchised, misrepresented minority employees have taken their grievances to the courts. But that is a long, slow, cumbersome, expensive, and ineffective method of protecting the common right to make a living. It is no substitute for the real representation which is denied these employees through the combined effects of present union constitutions and of the Railway Labor Act.

As I said, the situation which Congress now permits is bad enough, and the feeble little proviso which is in the bill, and which I quoted a moment ago, is no remedy for it.

But what is proposed in S. 3295, unless it be amended as I am now proposing, would be infinitely worse. It would remove the governing groups of those unions which now refuse real membership or representation to minorities among the employees from any compulsion ever to recognize these minority rights. It would confirm the present situation, and give it congressional blessing. It would end all possibility of railroad employees of the Negro race ever securing those equal rights of employment to which they are justly entitled.

The issue here is not one of social relations. I do not propose that railroad labor unions shall be required to admit Negroes to membership if they do not want to do so. But I do propose—and every instinct of justice endorses the proposal—that if any union wishes to enter into a contract with any railroad by which employees shall be compelled to become union members as a condition of employment, then at the same time such a union shall open its membership to all employees otherwise qualified, without discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or national origin.

There is a very practical aspect of this situation. So long as Negroes, for example, are excluded from membership, or are confined to limited or auxiliary membership in the very organizations which are supposed to represent them in the vital matter of employment, then Negroes are not in any true or proper sense of the word represented.

Negro employees of American railroads—and it should not be forgotten that American railroads are among the largest employers of Negro labor—know by bitter experience what this denial of the right of real representation means.

They have seen their rights of promotion, their opportunities to better themselves, even their basic opportunity to work for a railroad at all, bargained away by men whom they did not choose and upon whom they had no means of exerting effective influence.

If we here in Congress are now to strengthen the hands of these leaders of railroad labor, we should at the very least require them to come before us with clean hands, not hands besmirched

with the continuance of unjust, unjustifiable, un-American discrimination against those railroad workers who are of the Negro race.

That is what is proposed in the amendment which I have offered.

That is why I believe that this body, in the interest of economic fair play, should adopt the amendment as offered.

On December 7 the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said:

In effect, the bill inserts in the railway mediation law almost the exact provisions, so far as they fit, of the Taft-Hartley law.

But, Mr. President, the pending bill does not require the union seeking to establish a union shop to file with the Secretary of Labor a report on certain provisions of its constitution and bylaws, and that it shall file and also furnish to all members a financial statement showing receipts, assets and liabilities, disbursements, and other pertinent information. Such a report must be brought up to date annually, so says the Taft-Hartley law, but the Senator from Ohio cannot find such a provision in the pending bill.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that I do not know why the Congress at this juncture in history should be obliged to take time to consider such legislation as that now pending before the Senate. I believe the people of America are extremely sick and tired of politics as usual. There are more important things that should be before this body. But since the bill is here and since we are willing to take our precious treasure and blood all over the world to fight for other colored people's interests, what is wrong with giving our own colored brother in this country an even break? Both parties have played politics with the colored man; they have dangled civil rights before his eyes for many, many years. Here is a place to be fair, to be honest, and to be decent.

Mr. President, at this time I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered on Mr. JENNER's amendment, which is as follows:

On page 3, line 8, insert new paragraph twelfth to read as follows:

"Twelfth. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, or of any other statute of law of the United States, or Territory thereof, or of any State, any union, labor organization, or labor representative that segregates members into separate or auxiliary locals or excludes any member of the craft or class from membership therein on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin, or denies membership therein to any member of the craft or class upon terms or conditions not generally applicable to all members of the craft or class; or excludes any member of the craft or class from participation in the collective bargaining process; or that uses its position as a collective bargaining representative under this act to discriminate against members of the craft or class on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin; or that uses its position as such collective bargaining representative to bar the employment by the carrier of any person because of his race, creed, color, or national origin, shall not act as representative under this act of any craft

or class, and shall not be entitled to any of the provisions of the act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the other day when the question of this amendment was before the Senate, a number of Senators, representing different schools of thought in this body, voiced their opposition to the amendment, stating that it had no place on this bill.

Certainly this amendment has no place on this bill, for it is irrelevant to the bill. The purpose, the object, of this bill is to try to maintain and more nearly insure industrial peace in the great railroad industry which is so vital to the transportation and to the economic life of the Nation. The purpose of this bill is to secure, to maintain, and, insofar as possible, to insure stable, orderly, and harmonious relationships between management and labor in the railway industry. This amendment would do the very opposite; it is entirely opposed to the purpose of the bill, for the amendment would create feeling, disruption, and confusion. Not only would it impair the purpose of the bill, but it would defeat the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, I move that the amendment be laid on the table; and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, of course the yeas and nays go with a motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not necessarily so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hunt	Neely
Bridges	Ives	Nixon
Butler	Jenner	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Connally	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Leahy	Smith, N. C.
Donnell	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Dworschak	Lucas	Taylor
Eaton	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	McFarland	Thye
Frear	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	Williams
Hendrickson		Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HILL. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senate is now about to vote on the motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Indiana offered an amendment, and the Senator from Alabama moved that the amendment be tabled. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Flanders	Johnson, Tex.
Anderson	Frear	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Fulbright	Kefauver
Chavez	George	Kerr
Clements	Gillette	Kilgore
Connally	Gurney	Knowland
Cordon	Hayden	Leahy
Douglas	Hill	Lehman
Eaton	Holland	Long
Ellender	Hunt	Lucas

McCarthy
McClellan
McFarland
McKellar
McMahon
Magnuson
Malone
Millikin
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely

Nixon
O'Connor
Pepper
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoepfel
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Smith, N. C.
Stennis
Taft

Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Thye
Tobey
Tydings
Watkins
Wiley
Williams
Young

NAYS—17

Brewster
Bricker
Bridges
Butler
Cain
Capehart

Carlson
Donnell
Dworshak
Hendrickson
Hickenlooper
Ives

Jenner
Kem
Langer
Martin
Wherry

NOT VOTING—15

Benton
Chapman
Eastland
Ferguson
Green

Hoey
Humphrey
Johnson, Colo.
Lodge
McCarran

Maybank
Myers
O'Mahoney
Sparkman
Vandenberg

So Mr. HILL's motion to lay Mr. JENNER's amendment on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is another unanimous-consent agreement which the Chair understands is now in operation.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to make one announcement, and then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. President, after we finish consideration of the pending measure, which is the authorization of funds to take care of Yugoslavia, the question may arise as to what the Senate will next do. On tomorrow, Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia, who is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, will present a joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Control Act, as amended. It is an emergency matter and should be taken up at the earliest possible time. That will be the first thing on the program tomorrow.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Let me inform the distinguished majority leader that not more than 10 minutes should be required to pass the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. We shall at least make it the unfinished business after we dispose of the Yugoslavia bill. Possibly we can make disposition of it this afternoon.

Mr. President, I recently gave notice that the Senate would proceed to the consideration of a bill involving an amendment of the Clayton Act. That bill is Calendar No. 1737, H. R. 2734. It is my understanding that that measure will require approximately 2 days of

debate. Following the disposition of the District of Columbia rent-control bill, we propose to make the bill amending the Clayton Act the unfinished business. There are four other bills which have recently been reported—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the majority leader referring to Calendar No. 1777, H. R. 2734, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopoly, and for other purposes"?

Mr. LUCAS. That is the measure which I have in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the bill as to which I gave notice some time ago that we would try to dispose of during this session.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that in the event any other measure dealing with the emergency situation which exists throughout the world comes before the Senate, of course, the bill amending the Clayton Act will be laid aside, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of any other measure of emergency character which may be reported.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has reported four bills, namely, Calendar No. 2581, House bill 9484, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the settlement of claims for losses and damages inflicted upon the Portuguese territory of Macao by United States Armed Forces during World War II in violation of neutral rights; Calendar No. 2570, House bill 5902, an act for the relief of the Pan American Union; Calendar No. 2580, House bill 8546, an act to amend the Philippine Property Act of 1946, and Calendar No. 2569, House bill 7445, an act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.

These bills were passed by the House during the regular session. They have been carefully examined, so I am advised by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they are not of a controversial nature. I assume they can be taken up when we call the calendar. But, anyway, they are important measures, which we should dispose of, if possible, before we conclude the session. They will be considered following the disposition of the bill amending the Clayton Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention to call the calendar some time this session?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the calendar will be called once from the beginning.

Mr. WHERRY. When does the Senator contemplate calling the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. Possibly in the latter part of this week.

Mr. WHERRY. Another question, Mr. President. It is somewhat in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry, but I am satisfied that the majority leader will an-

swer it. When the agreement was entered into, under which we are now operating, relative to the proposed Yugoslavia relief bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] had an amendment pending when opposition to the proposed legislation developed. There are now other Senators who desire to offer amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. I read from the unanimous-consent agreement:

That the time intervening between the disposition of the so-called railway labor bill and the said hour of 4 o'clock on said day of Monday, December 11, shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the passage of said bill and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. McCARRAN.

The Senator from Texas accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], so there should not be too much further debate upon the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Then Senators who would like to offer amendments, if they want to take the time between now and 4 o'clock, could see, I suppose, the Senator from Nevada, in order to have time assigned to them in which to discuss their amendments. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is the way the unanimous-consent agreement reads.

Mr. WHERRY. There was some question on the division of time. I came in late, and I merely wanted to make sure. Of course, if there is an amendment offered after 4 o'clock, there will be 10 minutes allowed on each side.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what the agreement provides.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to that time, if a Senator wants to offer an amendment it will be necessary for him to have time allotted by the Senator from Nevada; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator want to make arrangements to take a little time now for that purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not see the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the majority leader make an answer to my request. I think it would be very timely to get some amendments out of the way and charge the time to both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have the floor. There is no great calamity impending.

Mr. President, in addition to the bills which I noted for the RECORD a moment ago, I also desire to include in the list Calendar No. 2583, the bill (H. R. 9524) to supplement the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949. I do not think very much controversy will develop with respect to that bill.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished majority leader has in mind calling up Calendar No. 2506, the bill (S. 3135) to amend the peanut-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I ask the

question because a vote on the quotas will be taken on the 14th of this month.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say to my able friend from New Mexico that I have not considered doing so because no Senator who is interested in the bill has talked to me about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, both Senators from Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina are interested in the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished majority leader will recall that I did speak to him as soon as we returned for the present session. I told him that if other pressing matters would permit, I hoped he would give us an opportunity to vote on the peanut bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Virginia. I recall that he did speak to me about the bill. Therefore, I shall include Calendar No. 2506, the bill (S. 3135) to amend the peanut-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in the list of bills which may be taken up at any time when a lull should develop in the proceedings of the Senate.

EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is entitled to the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Many Senators desire to present routine matters and offer brief insertions for the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to do so and that the time required be charged equally to both the opponents and the proponents of the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to such a request, provided we have sufficient time within which to discuss the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a tem-

porary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9840) to exempt furlough travel of service personnel from the tax on transportation of persons in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to factors which may tend to affect adversely the competitive enterprise system during a period of defense mobilization (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the creation of ten professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the Committee (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission on Licensure, of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a petition of St. Elizabeth's Post, No. 716, Catholic War Veterans of America, Baltimore, Md., signed by Jane H. O'Connor, adjutant, praying for the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connell (Rept. No. 2589);

S. 2460. A bill for the relief of George O. Drucker, Livia Drucker, and their minor daughter, Gloria Elizabeth Drucker (Rept. No. 2590);

S. 3125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman (Rept. No. 2591);

S. 3259. A bill for the relief of Ethelyn Isobel Chenalloy (Rept. No. 2592);

S. 3260. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Bush (Rept. No. 2593);

S. 3261. A bill for the relief of Willard Sidmer Ruttan (Rept. No. 2594);

S. 3378. A bill for the relief of Armando Santini (Rept. No. 2595);

S. 3554. A bill for the relief of Jose Manzano Somera (Rept. No. 2596);

S. 3897. A bill for the relief of Edwin A. Knous (Rept. No. 2619);

S. 4110. A bill for the relief of Howard Lovell (Rept. No. 2597);

S. 4133. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferdinand Van Den Branden (Rept. No. 2598);

H. R. 4579. A bill to amend section 333 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the attendance at judicial conferences of their respective circuits of the district judges in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, and Alaska (Rept. No. 2599);

H. R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, and Eleanor Chen (Rept. No. 2600);

H. R. 8334. A bill for the relief of Yamaguchi Michiko (Rept. No. 2601);

H. R. 9284. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (Rept. No. 2602); and

H. R. 9475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Enid Louise Noble Romick, Jr. (Rept. No. 2603).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington (Rept. No. 2604);

S. 3044. A bill for the relief of Berniece Josephine Lazaga (Rept. No. 2605);

S. 3241. A bill for the relief of George Brandér Paloheimo and Eva Leonora Paloheimo (Rept. No. 2606);

S. 3699. A bill for the relief of Linda Leo (Rept. No. 2607);

S. 3725. A bill for the relief of James McGillic and Blossom McGillic (Rept. No. 2608);

H. R. 8759. A bill for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang (Rept. No. 2609);

H. R. 8973. A bill for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour (Rept. No. 2610);

H. R. 9145. A bill for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya (Rept. No. 2611); and

H. R. 9236. A bill for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass. (Rept. No. 2612).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2830. A bill for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Kenyon (Rept. No. 2613);

S. 2921. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Stavros S. Niarchos (Rept. No. 2614); and

S. 3513. A bill for the relief of James Shellenger, Jr. (Rept. No. 2615).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5487. A bill to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, and of orders of the United States Maritime Commission or the Federal Maritime Board under the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 2618).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 2616) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:
A-5536319, Abraham, Veronika, or Veronica Abraham.

A-4344291, Abreu y Alvarez, Ricardo, or Richard Abreu.

A-6711109, Abstender, Liza, nee Liza Markowicz.

A-2245436, Ali, Asod, or Allí Asod Ullah or Asodeocolla Ashruffoolia.

A-5501876, Alinosi, Lottie Bernice, nee Dean.

A-3763210, Alma, Helen, nee Stedman Kinter or Alma S. Kinter or Alma Stedman Kinter.

A-4480223, Altamura, Pasquale.

A-6857826, Alter, Salomon Sloima.

A-5199171, Alvarez, Justina Martin.

A-3059986, Amat, Kasmoin, or Kasmoin Bin Amat.

A-6289628, Arce, Socorro Labrado Ylanan, or Socorro Labrado Rodrigues (maiden name), formerly Socorro Labrado Ylanan alias Mrs. Joe Manila.

A-6439301, Arcellana, Juan Aquino.

A-5395748, Arnold, Gustavus or Gus Arnold.

A-5987632, Arron, Barbara, or Sydney Barbara Arron or Barbara Lewis.

A-5158808, Ashton, Sarah Ellen, or Sarah Ellen Lewis nee Muskett.

A-3594093, Asrlant, Willy, or Wolka Asrlant or Zev Wolf.

A-5906951, Auriammo, Elsie.

A-1619827, Avvantaggio, Frank, or Frank Conti.

A-7044374, Bagues, Salvador, or Ruben Marrufo or Salvador Bagues-Villanueva.

A-5134324, Bahler, Karl F., or Karl Friedrich Bahler or Karl Bahler.

A-6030813, Basalo-Sosa, Carmen Teresa.

A-6172610, Bautista, Adalia Marquez de.

A-6702357, Benintende, Francesco, or Frank Benintende.

A-5156017, Berken, Regina Jean Matyas.

A-6719358, Bijjani, George Yousuf.

A-5624281, Birzner, Lina Margareta.

A-6975483, Blount, Richard Keith.

A-5652886, Blumberg, Barney Masel, or Boroch Blumberg.

A-4964138, Boeschling, Henry Frederick Wilhelm.

A-6427944, Bohn, Odette, nee De Rich or Rich.

A-5722987, Bonacasa, Liborio, or Benny Bonacasa or Bonacasa Liborio.

A-4068857, Bongini, Christino, or Christino Bongini.

A-5944282, Boutilier, Verner Trinimon, or Fred Gavin.

A-7049222, Bovoletis, Peter Considine.

A-5110682, Brega, Ernesto.

A-6687726, Brown, Basilette Argendeli, nee Argendeli.

A-5932145, Brown, Percy Flint.

A-6614098, Brown, Vernal Albert.

A-5648521, Bruck, Lila, or Hedwig Drdlik or Hedwig Bruck.

A-6732457, Bulleri, Dora Luigiana.

A-4490134, Burack, Sam.

A-5085609, Cardoza, Joao Ferreira, or John F. Cardoza.

A-7178248, Carlson, Berna Birgit Allrum.

A-4399018, Carroll, Louis Lawrence, or Louis Carroll.

A-5972088, Carty, Peter Silven.

A-2746974, Casals, Domingo, or Domingo Cassis y Costa.

A-6642478, Chaltas, Aristeia Constantinou Katraouzou, or Aristeia Constantinou Katraouzou.

A-6187140, Chan, William Hee, or Gik Hee Chan.

A-6187141, Chan, Linda Siu King, or Chum Shao King.

A-5552575, Charleson, Frank Langelier.

A-7539135, Chiang, Chien Yin, or Chien Chick Yin.

A-6798761, Yink, Chiang Chu Sheng, nee Chu Sheng Ying.

A-3291982, Chikhmatoff, Olga Chirinsky, or Olga Shirinsky Shikhmatoff nee Korff.

A-7273887, Clewis, Raimor Herman, or Raimor Herman Clewis, formerly Raimor Herman Saladin, or Raimor Herman Saladin.

A-6230243, Cohen, Albert Kibrit, or Alberto Cohen Kibrit, or Albert Cohen.

A-1455053, Constantios, Philippos Nikolas, or Philip Constantios.

A-3021828, Costa, Amedeo Giovanni, or Amedeo G. Costa.

A-5811577, Damhus, Ejnar Jensen, or Edward, or Eddy Damhus.

A-4822959, Dapas, Pietro, or Peter Dapas.

A-6690314, De Acosta, Petronila Machuca.

A-6603146, De Barrios, America Cabrera.

A-6603143, Barrios Y Cabrera, Jesus.

A-6787390, De Escobedo, Consuelo Gomez-Alonzo, or Rafaela Lopez.

A-7050144, De Ferrari, Felicina Gallo, nee Felicina Serafina Gallo.

A-6455865, De Grimwood, Laura Antonia Padilla.

A-1101037, Delikat, Lottie Margaret.

A-6323338, Dennis, Edward Victor, or Edward Victor Brown.

A-1412812, Diamantis, Stavros Spyridon.

A-5346801, Di Carlo, Calogero, or Calogero Lello Di Carlo.

A-4418201, Doorly, Joseph, or Joseph Dorley.

A-7273891, Doring, Uwe Franz.

A-5618814, Dumkolis, Trifo Alexander, or Trifo Alexander Dumkoloff, or Trifo Alex Dumkeles.

A-6897795, Eastman, Elsa Orio, formerly Elsa Orio Garchitorenne nee Elsa Erinka Oria.

A-6852384, Elefant, Clara, or Elder nee Lakatos.

A-5151368, Enomoto, Mihacri or Jack.

A-6364325, Entralgo, Luis Estella.

A-4789169, Esop, Edward.

A-6811187, Esposito, Lucian Nicolas.

A-7196657, Essoglou, Panteleimon Lile.

A-6745435, Estaque, Jeanne nee Seitelsohn.

A-6162093, Faustino, Iluminador Flores.

A-6362677, Femino, Marina Domenica Grace, formerly Hislop.

A-6420315, Fieldhouse, Roger Hyde.

A-1842349, Figueiras, Jose Gallardo, or Jose Gallardo.

A-7203232, Flanagan, Johanna Adriana.

A-4570472, Fogel, Morris, or Moische Fogel.

A-6878609, Forcke, Nadine Elwin.

A-6878610, Forcke, Eddie Wallace.

A-3079984, Fournaris, Constantinos Georgios, or Constantinos Fournaris, or Gus Fournaris or Kostas Fournaris.

A-6808868, Franklin, Gudrun, or Gudrun Bruinsma.

A-5456991, Friedman, Fanny or Kalmar.

A-1875873, Fu, Huang, or Wong Fook or Wong Fook Nygoon, or Wong Fook Yuan, or Wong Chun Go.

A-7039621, Galati, Salvatore.

A-5739972, Galati, Maria Antico.

A-7198759, Gampe, Roland Pierre Lucien, or Roland P. Gampe.

A-5854618, Garden, Janet Miller, or Jean Whatling.

A-6353465, Gernaey, Marie Madeline nee Kemmer, or Marie Madeline Jablonski.

A-6872607, Godley, Percival Francis, or Francis Percival Godley.

A-6872608, Godley, Doris nee Eldred.

A-6649919, Goldstein, Rubin, or Riven Goldstein.

- A-1046757, Goldstein, Sol.
 A-6506566, Grille, Paul Jacques.
 A-1868318, Gronek, Helena, or Helen Gronek.
 A-6965863, Grun, Elza, or Elise Weisz, or Elszl or Eliz or Elsa.
 A-6784146, Gubel, Josef.
 A-4306817, Guerrero, Bozena Tomankova, nee Bozena Tomankova.
 A-6164825, Gum, Mim, or Min Gum.
 A-7131216, Guthrie, James.
 A-3199500, Gutierrez, Dolores, or Dolores Arroyo.
 A-4146713, Gutierrez, Guadalupe, alias Guadalupe Arroyo.
 A-1976967, Hagymasi, Terez, or Terez Massey.
 A-1601361, Hallas, Dionisios or Georgadidgh.
 A-6905340, Hand, Monique Yvonne, nee Placide.
 A-1822905, Handell, Vitall, and Victor Handell.
 A-6497132, Hardy, Cornelia Agatha.
 A-6022964, Haritopoulos, Elias Theodore, alias Elias Charitopoulos, alias Louis Haritopoulos.
 A-3295410, Hartmann, Barbara, nee Hess.
 A-6216009, Hastings, John.
 A-7115400, Hayes, James Victor.
 A-5308606, Heinz, Joseph Karl.
 A-6861917, Hendrickson, Agda Jakobina, formerly Ruutikainen, nee Meriruusu.
 A-6567798, Holen, Jenny Klara, nee Walderhaug.
 A-6243527, Hou, Ai Ying, or Mah Ah Ying, or Wang Ai Ying.
 A-6853305, Howe, Maclean Kenneth Daniel, alias Hau Kam Tat or Daat.
 A-6838592, Hristostomidis, Hristostomis Yani, or Chris John Hristostomidis.
 A-6245685, Hronis, Sophie.
 A-7530134, Hsiang, Ping, or Ping Hsian Hsiang, or Catherine Hsiang, or Bian Hsian Hsiang, or Hsiang Bin Hsien.
 A-3043752, Huffan, Edwin Eric.
 A-5872012, Hum, Lee Shee, or Hum Lee Shee.
 A-6505446, Huvos, Laszlo, or Leslie Huvos.
 A-6590020, Iacovetta, Osvaldo, or Osvaldo Iacovetta, or Osvaldo Iacouetta.
 56093/439, Ibrahim, Mehmet, or Ibrahim Mehmet, or Mehmed Abraham.
 A-6367213, Iversen, Bjorg Wennberg.
 A-6455634, Jacks, Edna Eulalia, nee Barkas, or Edna E. Jacks.
 A-6872541, James, Poullia, or Poullia Cotsifa, maiden name, or Poullia Kotsifa.
 A-5665665, Jaresch, Emma Johanna.
 A-6930157, Jarosz, Ingelise Solveig, nee Jensen.
 A-2395816, Kakowoulis, Nicolis, or Nickolis Kakowoulis.
 A-7115013, Kastanos, Antonios Simos.
 A-3930365, Kew, Ko, or Kew Ko.
 A-6369146, Khouri, Mounira, nee Mounira Abouzeid, or Mme. Vve Nagib.
 A-7189565, Kiang, Stuart, or Chao-Hai Kiang.
 A-1757786, Kilian, Jozef.
 A-6187117, Kim, June Jha.
 A-7043054, Kiu, Kong Yuet, or Cecile Kong, or Tong Yuet Kiu.
 A-5398701, Klesznicki, Wilhelm August, or Wilhelm Klesznicki, or William August Klesznicki, or William August Klesznicki.
 A-5110558, Knaus, Maximilian, or Max Knaus.
 A-5289330, Knudsen, Soren Anton, or Steve Knudsen.
 A-5282771, Kurth, Paul Gustav.
 A-6254761, Kyriakids, Makrina, or Makrina S. Kyriakides, or Makrina Socrates Kyriakides, nee Makrina Kouzoudjacojuhu.
 A-9511403, Lal, Leung.
 A-5472117, Larsen, Christian Peter, or Christian Peter Werdelbon.
 A-5187667, Larsen, Dagny Kirstine Johanna Sorensen.
 A-7039676, Larsen, Betty Dagny.
 A-6008146, Lawver, Maria Tome Da Silva.
 A-5336741, Lee, Hung Yuke.
 A-1663081, Lekich, John, or John Sam Lekich.
 A-6510544, Lemak, Oscar.
 A-6510545, Lemak, Zoltan.
 A-9749126, Leon, Francisco Ysmael Martinez, or Francisco Martinez.
 A-7053056, Lewis, Rosane Maria, or Rosana Maria Mannucci, Rosanna Mannucci.
 A-4280100, Lima, Jose Paiva, or Jose De Paiva Lima.
 A-7141199, Lincourt, Linda Margaret, or Linda Margaret Suitter.
 A-2303848, Linkous, Gladys Corless nee Corless.
 A-7099284, Loeschnigg, Janet, or Misuet Loeschnigg, or Misuet Loeschnigg.
 A-6620856, Lognoff, Natalie N.
 A-6817715, Lowe, Evelyn Joan, nee Sommerfeld or Summerfield, formerly Rutherford.
 A-1394882, Luckiewicz, Joseph Kazimierz.
 A-4866489, Luehmann, Alwin Albert Hermann.
 A-6182809, Luis Domingo.
 A-1162558, Macpherson, Donald Joseph.
 A-1001691, Madore, Rose Marie, nee Cote or Rose Marie Labrie.
 A-7140937, Mahlmann, Dirk Robert, or Dirk Robert Vogel or Dirk Robert Hogan.
 A-5537676, Majchrzak, Mary.
 A-2244345, Manalis, John Ioannis.
 A-5914713, Marchetti, Pietro Guido, or Pietro Marchetti or Pete Marchetti or Francisco Genetti.
 A-3325763, Mark, See Cheung.
 A-4778299, Markiori, Emilio, or Emilio Marchiori or Emilio Marki.
 A-7083230, Markoures, Irene Panageotou, or Irini Athanasios Panageotou.
 A-7140936, Marlmann, Rainer Wolfgang, or Rainer Wolfgang Hogan.
 A-4632664, Marmorstein, Alexander, or Alex M. Stone.
 A-6611011, Marwick, Nancy Joy.
 A-1205669, Masuko, Sadao.
 A-3397407, Matchkaloff, Alexander Serge, or Alexander S. Machavariani or Alexander S. Sedrakovitch Machkaloff or Alexander S. Machavarian or Alexander Angelo.
 A-5427886, Matthiesen, Heinrich, or Heinrich Walter Matthiesen.
 A-5147605, McCombs, Gordon Leslie.
 A-4374141, Mckay, Sariphas.
 A-5829263, Mehr, Lena Melissa, or Lena Melissa Bates, nee Goodwin.
 A-2997698, Menagatos, Soterios Demitriou, alias Sam Poulos.
 A-6799595, Mendoza, Jose Leofranco Perez.
 A-6953451, Metzger, Henryk.
 A-6068690, Meukow, Walter Trendel, or Walter Trendel.
 A-6172753, Millios, Argyro, or Argyro Millou nee Argyro Gouliou.
 A-6989727, Mitchell, Irene nee Tsingheraki.
 A-4774831, Mohamed, Niaz.
 A-7092580, Montesantos, Eleftherios, or Terry Montesantos.
 A-4441139, Moret, Giovanni Battista, or John Moret.
 A-5644709, Morrall, Edgar Michael, or William Henry Thomas.
 A-4314060, Moss, Joseph.
 A-5868852, Moss, Sarah.
 A-5412142, Muil, Kan Chi, or Lung Sheung Muil.
 A-4854667, Muniz-Gardea, Sotero, or Sotero G. Muniz or Sotero Soto.
 A-4854668, De Muniz, Catalina Gomez.
 A-7064744, Mustapa, Margit Hildegard, or Margit Hildegard Jarvinen.
 A-1514718, Nacinovich, Frank.
 A-6074029, Nevarez, Heriberto, or Heriberto Nevarez Valencia.
 A-6706845, Ngou, Jew Yee Sue.
 A-5714884, Nicholoff, Karl Christ, or Karl Nicholoff or Kyrillos Bozannis Nicholoff.
 A-2886564, Nicolas, Herman Henry or Nicholas.
 A-6722391, Nicoletopoulos, Leonidas Diomidis.
 A-5310261, Norby, Arnt.
 A-5156554, Ohnstein, Martin, or Charles Hagendorf.
 A-5295492, Olesen, Marius Imanuel.
 A-1188009, Orro, Ano Rosa, or Nina R. Lopez or Maria Teresa Cartaya.
 A-1119930, Orsini, Filippo.
 A-5022341, Ortiz, Jose, or Joseph Ortiz or Jose Ortiz Camus.
 A-6572200, Ortiz, Robert.
 A-5221301, Paliaga, Peter.
 A-5157878, Palmes, Stanley Gerald.
 A-5212363, Paolini, Giuseppe, formerly Giuseppeina Milesi nee Bargellini.
 A-5081215, Papadopoulos, Yoannis, or Ioannis, Papadopoulos.
 A-6947402, Paplitzky, Ingeborg Ingrid.
 A-6280674, Pascual, Marta Villarin.
 A-6630763, Pataki, Viola Klara nee Lanyi.
 A-7203344, Paulsen, Greta Juul.
 A-7117535, Paulsen, Einar Juul.
 A-7110852, Penalva, Marcel Aime.
 A-4897907, Perugini, Pasquale Aniello, or Pasquale Perugini.
 A-5137818, Pfeiffer, Richard Ewald.
 A-7178604, Pilos, Thalia Kalkandis, or Thalia Kalkandis or Thalis Stavros Pilos or Thalia Stavros Kalkandis.
 A-2069819, Pina, Enrique alias Henry Pina.
 A-7203340, Piscope, Domenico.
 A-6849316, Pla, Yolande, or Yolande Prato.
 A-6725293, Pohanc, Zoltan Imre.
 A-4390552, Polzin, Rudolf.
 A-3117457, Poppo, Demetrios, or Demilrios Poppo.
 A-7083227, Powell, Alwyn Leslie.
 A-5664259, Prol, Antonio Alvarez.
 A-7072434, Proskouriakoff, Irene Daniel.
 A-7049124, Purdy, Cassie May.
 A-5455840, Puzolo, Giuseppe.
 A-1643444, Rabias, Constantinos Nicolaos.
 A-1595278, Radulich, Blasul, or Blasul Radulich.
 A-6296121, Redfern, Ruth Myrtle.
 A-6296119, Redfern, Allan Henry.
 A-5630645, Redwood, Margaret nee Margaret Marshall.
 A-7097046, Rein, Monika.
 A-3543705, Reis, Rosa Oliveira nee Rosa Candida Oliveira.
 A-5911903, Rigas, Eleftherios.
 A-6995278, Rim, Lilly Mary (Mrs. Herbert Rim) nee Lilly Mary Ruppert or Lilly Mary Ruppert De Rin by a former marriage Mrs. Hans Neumann.
 A-7044264, Roberts, Grace Ruth Kearny.
 A-5068648, Roininen, Laina Maria, or Laina Maria Roine.
 A-7050590, Rosadio, Jose.
 A-6018546, Rosenblum, Lajb, or Leo Rosenblum.
 A-5127498, Rosenlund, Rolf.
 A-1107407, Roston, Albert Joseph, or Abraham Josef Rothstein.
 A-6307307, Roth, Elizabeth Evelyn Achica, or Elizabeth Evelyn Achica.
 A-6569422, Rubinstein, Israel.
 A-1991240, Rukoje, Jadwiga, or Jean Rukoje or Jadwiga Rukoje.
 A-5080828, Sa, Manuel Afonso.
 A-7013315, Sackville, Patricia Ann.
 A-7013316, Sackville, Roma Collard.
 A-5562524, Salczar, Herman, or Herman Salcer.
 A-6985669, Sam, Choy (Chinese name), or Johnny Sam Choy (American name).
 A-6268524, Sanchez, Domingo Valluluz.
 A-7189991, Sarno, Mamerto Torres, or Mamerto Torres.
 A-7189992, Sarno, Rosauro Torres, or Rosauro Torres.
 A-7199021, Sawaya, Louis Neemer.
 A-9177018, Slavogiannis, Emmanuel.
 A-7203550, Schenk, Knut.
 A-5856538, Schertzer, Michael.
 A-1689901, Schlemann, Wilhelm Johannes.
 A-7050939, Scillama, Antonia, nee Restivo.

A-4319937, Scocco, Giacomo.
 A-5258278, Scott, Louise, nee Harris.
 A-4204299, Seymour, Alex.
 A-3383663, Shee, Jew, or Jew Ngui Haal.
 A-2547932, Shong, Wong, or Shong Wong.
 A-1413437, Sima, Albin Franz.
 A-7044320, Sirigos, Antonios Nicolaos, or Antonios Sirigos or Anthony Sirigos.
 A-6394192, Skorpak, William.
 A-4803564, Slows, Mendel.
 A-7050623, Smith, Constance Agnes, nee Brady.
 A-6047633, Smith, Vina, nee Mitchell.
 A-5707986, Smoke, Josef, or Josef Smuk.
 A-3445330, Soler, Maria Barber, or Mother Bienvenida De San Jose.
 A-2587707, Sonck, Edouard.
 A-1748368, Souze, Joao Azevedo, or John Azevedo Souza.
 A-6965414, Spigno, Enrico Giuseppe.
 A-5931914, Stapleton, Thomas Michael.
 A-3631892, Stefanovich, Mitre, or Mitro or Stefanoff alias Jim Stevens, Mitro Stefan Nadanovic, Mitre Stefan or Stefanou, Stoyanis Egos.
 A-6389053, Stein, Paul, or Pelta Szejn.
 A-6389054, Szejn, Rywka, or Rita Stein.
 A-6448763, Stern, Irving, or Isac, Isak, and Isaac Stern.
 A-5368221, Stoor, John Hjalmar.
 A-7140315, Stout, Catharina Maria, nee Berendsen.
 A-6664171, Stow, Peggy Spencer or Peggy Spencer (maiden name).
 A-7594279, Straus, Ernst Gabor.
 A-6236237, Suan-Chi, Lee, or Suan Chi Lee or Stephen Charles Lee.
 A-4133791, Suarez, Francisco Betanco, or Frank P. Suarez or Frank Petanco or (Petanko) or Frankly Bestanco or Manuel Martinis or Francisco Suarez Betanco or Francisco Betancor Santana Suarez.
 A-1611150, Suchman, Andrew, or Arpad Suchman or Suchmann.
 A-6245755, Sultanis, Aphrodite.
 A-5090585, Szekely, Istvan Attila.
 A-5339009, Sziber, John, or Joan.
 A-7112131, Sztankay, Zoltan Ferencz.
 A-7112528, Sztankay, Ada Hackl, nee Adelheid Josephine Marie Hackl.
 A-4453899, Tasco, Vincenzo.
 A-6446668, Teitelbaum, Hana, Mrs., or Mrs. Hana Teitelbaum, nee Halberstam.
 A-6923989, Theocharis, George Emanuel.
 A-9023412, Thomas, Pnangiotos Sotiriou, or Pete Thomas.
 A-6869332, Thorne, Julia Veronica, formerly Julia Veronica Loft nee Cohoon.
 A-4982652, Thornton, Patrick, or Patrick Joseph Thornton.
 A-6816830, Torres-Hernandez, Nicanor, or Nicanor Torres-Torres.
 A-6475654, Trepper, Moritz, or Morris Trepper or Noishe Trepper.
 A-2533644, Tselentis, Jerasimas, alias Jerry Lent.
 A-4947416, Tsistinas, Andreas Christos.
 A-6964992, Tzetzos, Evangelos, or Angelo Tzetzos.
 A-6930397, Uscatu, Everdichia.
 A-5924685, Utter, Alice Ruth nee Simmons.
 A-6732030, Valensi, Cleopatra, or Cleopatra Manoussaki.
 A-2594465, Van De Velde, Martha Maria, or Martha Van De Velde alias Martha Maria Van Haver.
 A-5161342, Van Der Veen, Olga, or Olga Van Der Neen Wisner.
 A-6854557, Van Tilburg, Cornelius Arnoldes, or John Beckos.
 A-6665383, Velge, William.
 A-5215026, Verticchio, Giuseppe.
 A-5204879, Von Bomsdorff, Felix.
 A-5507120, Vonderohr, William Lillie, or William Lillie.
 A-1099779, Wadeikis, Veronica Irene.
 A-4448744, Wan Fong.
 A-6419308, Wang, Francis Chwen-Tao.

A-6341236, Warr, Rosa, nee Rosa or Rose Mahfooz.
 A-6521597, Wassner, Danuta, or Danuta Ziff.
 A-6233641, Wawrzkiwicz, Rura Serrano, nee Pura Serrano.
 A-4247813, Weinberg, Morris (Moishe).
 A-4166705, Weinberg, Tillie, nee Schneider or Taube, Toba or Tobe Weinberg.
 A-7145747, Weiss, Lieselotte.
 A-7053511, Wells, Adelheid Anna, or Adelheid Anna Schuecke (Schucke) nee Klinner (Kinner).
 A-4448745, Wing, Fung Sik, or Fung Yee Wing.
 A-4687569, Woo, Ji-Hung.
 A-4687621, Woo, Yun-Chwang, or Woo Chung.
 A-4687620, Woo, Echng Shen, or Mrs. Y. C. Woo.
 A-6514174, Yankelewitz, Leib or Leon.
 A-4532669, Yau, Au (Owyau).
 A-4532661, Yeung, Fung Kim.
 A-4772969, Young, Kenneth Abram.
 A-4532655, Yum, Ma.
 A-7582013, Yung, Yip Kung, alias Benjamin Yip.
 A-5323816, Zacks, Milly, or Millie Sachs formerly Milka Zuk.
 A-6882598, Santamarina y Alvarez, Fernando Garcia, or Fernando Garcia Santamarina.
 A-3630195, Fry, Madeleine Thurza, nee Logan.
 A-5140180, Mitani, Masatane.

INTERNAL SECURITY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 366) relating to the internal security of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 2617) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 366) relating to the internal security of the United States, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 4240. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; and

S. 4241. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine (a) the powers of said corporation, (b) the right to the use of the name "The American Legion" and "American Legion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 4242. A bill to include personnel of the Armed Forces on active military, naval, or air service on or after June 25, 1950, in the term "veteran of any war"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4243. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Fazal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 4244. A bill to extend to nations with which the United States engages in armed conflict the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 4245. A bill for the relief of Teresa E. Dwyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9840) to exempt fur-lough travel of service personnel from the tax on transportation of persons, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CURRENT WORLD CRISIS—RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio interview between him and Mr. Don Passante over Station WNJR, Newark, N. J., Saturday, December 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HISS VERDICT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT AND EDITORIAL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and an editorial entitled "Hiss Verdict Upheld," published in the Washington Post on December 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE WAR

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Right of Congress To Declare War," published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH SERVICES

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Services," published in the Washington Post on December 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER STUDY FOR NEW ENGLAND

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Power Study Set for New England," published in the New York Times of December 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram regarding American foreign policy, addressed to the President by Mr. John J. Sattler, commander, Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHOWDOWN WITH FRIENDS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Showdown With Friends," published in the Oregon Daily Journal of December 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBVERSIVES CONTROL ACT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Job For Congress," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Real Displaced Persons," written by Marie T. Gerhard, and published in April 1950 issue of the Magnificat, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF TARIFF POLICIES ON THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—BRIEF OF THE WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief entitled, "The Impact of International Trade on the State of Wisconsin," prepared by the Wisconsin

sin Manufacturers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S POINT 4 PROGRAM—BROADCAST BY SENATOR BENTON AND BERT ANDREWS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator Benton regarding a radio discussion of President Truman's point 4 program, by him and Bert Andrews on December 2, 1950, together with a copy of the broadcast, which appear in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN MORALS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON AND EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator Benton and an editorial entitled "Campaign Morals," published in the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PROBLEMS OF NATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE JUNCTION CITY (OREG.) TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Junction City Times for December 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BAD WEEK FOR THE BIG LIE—BROADCAST BY CHARLES M. HULTEN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast delivered at Valley Forge, Pa., by Charles M. Hulten, of the State Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL BY GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by George V. Denny, Jr., president of Town Hall, New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY COURTS—LETTER TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter by Arthur E. Farmer, addressed to the New York Times, under date of April 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURRENT CASE INVOLVING RAILWAY CONDUCTORS AND RAILROAD TRAINMEN—LETTER FROM L. W. HORNING TO W. P. KENNEDY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. L. W. Horning to Mr. W. P. Kennedy, under date of September 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS AND OUR MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS—ADDRESS BY. HON. W. COOPER GREEN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Congress and Our Municipal Governments," delivered by Hon. W. Cooper Green, mayor of Birmingham, Ala., and president of the Alabama League of Municipalities, at a dinner in Washington on December 4, 1950, given by the Alabama delegation to the American Municipal Congress in honor of Alabama's Senators and Members of the House delegation in Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD CRISIS STEMS FROM MANY ERRORS—ARTICLE BY HOLMES ALEXANDER

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "World Crisis Stems From Many Errors," written by Holmes Alexander and published in the Salt Lake Tribune of De-

cember 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMBARGO ON GOODS DESTINED TO RED CHINA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, it would seem most pertinent to call to the attention of the Senate an announcement by the Honorable C. D. Howe, Canadian Trade Minister, on Saturday, December 9, to the effect that he had ordered an embargo on all Canadian goods destined for Red China.

The order applied, he made clear, to Korea, Hong Kong, Manchuria, and Macao, and he emphasized that all export permits previously granted would be recalled for revalidation.

The official action of the Canadian Government in this respect points up sharply the nonaction of our own Government to protect United States interests and to safeguard our fighting men in Korea, by placing a similar complete embargo on all shipments to Communist China.

The disclosures of the subcommittee investigating this matter have shocked the people of this country with information regarding the vast amounts of strategic materials of many kinds, the shipments of which our Government has not only permitted but actually encouraged to the fullest.

I say again what I have declared before both on the Senate floor and on other occasions that a complete embargo against all shipments to China is absolutely vital to our Nation's interests at this time when every product from this country which helps either to further their aggression in Korea or to bolster their industrial or civilian economy adds to the terrific load which our fighting men are carrying at this very moment.

The executive branch of our Government will be acting in accord with the feelings of the United States Senate, I am sure, just as they will be carrying out the wishes of the great mass of our people throughout the country, if they act immediately to restrict all shipments from this country to Communist China or other Communist points.

I ask that the Associated Press dispatch regarding the Canadian embargo be printed herewith as a part of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of December 9, 1950, entitled "Trading With the Enemy" be made a part of my remarks. Let me quote just the first sentence of this editorial:

Whatever justification there may have been in the past for maintaining trade relations with Communist China, a drastic change in policy has become necessary as a result of Chinese entry in the Korean war.

I concur wholeheartedly in that statement and offer it for the thoughtful consideration of the responsible Federal authorities in this field.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA CANCELS CHINA SHIPMENTS

OTTAWA, December 9.—C. D. Howe, Trade Minister, today ordered an embargo on all Canadian goods destined for Red China.

The order applies also to Korea, Hong Kong, Manchuria, and Macao—all in or near the eastern war area.

The main point of the order is to ban all goods from shipment to the Chinese Communists. Hong Kong, a British possession, is a transshipment point for goods going to the Chinese mainland.

Howe said in a statement all export permits granted will be recalled "for revalidation."

The embargo is, in a way, a reversal of government policy. Though Canada has had restrictions on the export of strategic goods to Communist countries, previous policy was to allow normal civilian trade to function.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 9, 1950]

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Whatever justification there may have been in the past for maintaining trade relations with Communist China, a drastic change in policy has become necessary as a result of Chinese entry in the Korean war. The Department of Commerce has just announced tighter export controls on shipments to Red China. That tightening was needed is evident from disclosures made by Chairman O'Conor of a Senate Commerce Subcommittee. The inquiry has indicated that substantial quantities of steel and rubber products that possibly could be diverted to military purposes have been shipped to Communist China since the start of the Korean war.

Senator O'Conor has charged that more than 10,000,000 pounds of scrap rubber have gone to the China mainland during the past 5 months. This rubber, in the form of old tires, is used for making shoes. And shoes have definite military value. Senator O'Conor pointed out that shipments of scrap rubber jumped from 263,000 pounds in July to 4,400,000 pounds in September and about 3,000,000 in October. "It seems perfectly evident," the Marylander said, "that the Communists would not bring all this rubber to China, at great expense, unless they were finding good use for it."

The time has come to consider something more effective than a tightening of trade controls. Formerly it was to our advantage to exchange products with the Reds, for we were getting considerable quantities of strategic tungsten from them. But apparently the Russians have cornered the Chinese tungsten supply in recent months, for shipments of tungsten have been falling off sharply. About all we are receiving from Red China now is hog bristles, animal hair, and feathers. These are useful to us, but not indispensable.

Commerce officials say that the new controls can be drawn tighter at will—that, in fact, the machinery has been set up to enforce a complete embargo on trade with Communist China if that final step becomes advisable. They point out, however, that an American embargo would mean little to the Reds unless other western nations took similar action. Irrespective of the economic effect of a unilateral embargo, an important principle is involved—that of trading with the enemy. And surely there no longer can be any doubt left that Red China is an open enemy of this country.

THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last Saturday the New York Journal-American and a number of other newspapers published an article written by Constantine Brown, the well-known foreign-news analyst, dealing with the Korean war. In the New York Journal-American the article is entitled: "Political and Military Summary of Korean

War: Writer Called the Turn on Events in the Far East—Declared United States Was Informed."

Mr. President, because of the accuracy of Mr. Brown's predictions in the past, because of his ability to call the turn on future events, and because of the significance of such instances in the past when he called the trend of our foreign events and the probable happenings which would result therefrom, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brown's article, together with the headlines which I have read, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL AND MILITARY SUMMARY OF KOREAN WAR: WRITER CALLED THE TURN ON EVENTS IN FAR EAST—DECLARES UNITED STATES WAS INFORMED

(By Constantine Brown)

There is no question that the outbreak of hostilities in Korea on June 25 caught the administration totally unprepared for a military undertaking of the magnitude which confronts us now.

Our highest officials claim they did not have the information needed to justify military preparedness of the kind needed in a shooting war.

The following items, taken at random from a number of columns published by this reporter during the last 12 months, show, however, that the administration was fully informed about Russia's plans and intentions.

ITEMS LISTED

Newspapermen obtain their information from sources near the top Government officials some time after the latter have had the full benefit of the reports.

Following are the items:

December 18, 1949: "The world crisis * * * is expected to enter its final phase with the coming of the new year. The Russians have nearly completed the circle which they have so skillfully been building around us since VJ-day."

January 23, 1950: "It is believed they (the Russians) will concentrate * * * on South Korea, Indochina, Burma, and eventually the Malay Peninsula."

February 5: "The United States is in a more critical situation than ever before in its history." (About this time Secretary Johnson began to trim the fat of our armed services.)

February 24: "We are in a weaker position with respect to Russia today than we were with respect to Japan 9 years ago."

READY TO MOVE

April 30: "Russia * * * has given indications that she is tiring of the cold war and is preparing to move into action."

May 9: "More than 2,000 Soviet officers are engaged * * * in planning coming events in Asia, which is expected to become the principal theater of a shooting war this summer."

June 4: "Whatever explosion may occur in the near future will come on the Asiatic mainland."

June 6: "The start of the * * * Communist invasion * * * (of Korea) is set for the second half of this month." (Confirmed June 25.)

September 1: "The middle of September will see Russian puppet Ho Chi Minh's Communist force launch an offensive against the French troops in Indo-China." (Confirmed Sept. 19.)

September 11: "Chinese forces * * * on the Korean border have moved in and now are fighting under the North Korean banner."

October 4: "Chinese Communist troops are definitely capable of going into action in an hour's notice."

November 7: "Our forces in Korea are so entangled by advancing Chinese Communists that only a heavy bombardment * * * between Mukden and the Yalu River can disentangle them."

"Behind the 300,000 Chinese troops on the Yalu River and in North Korea there are at least as many more troops available for action."

November 11: "A major attack by the Chinese Communist armies in North Korea is expected in the next 10 days * * * last week's attack * * * is considered a reconnaissance in force." (Confirmed Nov. 28.)

November 28: "General MacArthur is reported to have asked the United Nations for permission to send B-29 and B-36 planes to destroy the lines of communication * * * at Mukden and Harbin."

November 30: "Use of atomic bomb and Chinese Nationalist troops against the Chinese Communist hordes is now being discussed—in secret high-level discussions in the last 48 hours."

"We must face the stark fact that we are at war with Communist China, and by extension, with the U. S. S. R."

THE PRICE OF EGGS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Boston Post in a front page story on December 9 stated, "See eggs reaching \$1 a dozen."

The Wall Street Journal of last Friday carried the headline: "Wholesale egg prices reached 30-year high in Chicago yesterday. Record consumption responsible; top-quality eggs may hit \$1 a dozen in New York."

The Washington Post on a front page story carried the headline: "Price of grade A large eggs near dollar a dozen" last Saturday.

I wish to bring these headlines to the attention of the Senate, because, since reading these headlines, I have checked with the Commodity Credit Corporation and I find the following situation: The estimated inventory of dried eggs as of December 4, 1950, held by the United States Government amounts to 93,605,000 pounds. I am told by the Commodity Credit Corporation that it takes approximately 3 dozen large grade 1 eggs to make 1 pound of dried eggs. This means that it has taken 280,815,000 eggs to produce the poundage of dried eggs which the United States Government now has in storage. This is the equivalent of very nearly 2 dozen eggs for every man, woman, and child in America.

I also learned and wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues that on November 22 the Secretary of Agriculture issued a release stating that there would be no price support of eggs in 1951. This was later supplemented with a statement by the Secretary that if necessary in certain areas there would be a surplus removal of certain quantities of shell eggs which would be used in school-lunch programs.

I bring these facts to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, in the hope that in the critical days that lie ahead of us steps may be taken to try and stop such a situation in the case of any commodity. I hope that steps may be taken in the interest of the consuming public. I want to be fair to our farmers, but as

I have repeated many times, all of us are consumers. Eggs are perhaps the very basic food of the majority of the citizens of our country. Rises in the prices of eggs to record heights mean more, I believe, to more people than increases in the prices of any other agricultural commodity unless it be bread and milk.

Mr. President, in these difficult times when the very survival of our country may be at stake, I hope that our whole agricultural support program can be reviewed and restudied for the best interests of everyone.

Following my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the articles to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Post of December 9, 1950]

SEE EGGS REACHING \$1 A DOZEN—BOSTON PRICES ON RISE STEADILY SINCE MONDAY

Egg prices in the Boston wholesale market have jumped 4 to 11 cents a dozen this week, with a corresponding increase in the prices consumers have to pay, and unless the upward trend is halted, householders may soon be paying \$1 a dozen for the best eggs. The market has been moving upward since Monday. On that day large eggs were quoted at the Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange at 61 to 66 cents for large and 61 cents for mediums. Yesterday, large were 69 to 77 and mediums 65 to 70.

GIVE MANY REASONS

One stall at Faneuil Hall market Thursday had grade A jumbo size eggs at 98 cents a dozen retail and large were marked 85 cents. Some dealers predicted dollar-a-dozen eggs next week if wholesale prices go any higher. Bids on yesterday's supply to wholesalers stopped abruptly when the new high figure was reached. The would-be buyers simply would not go along as the quotations inched upward.

A variety of reasons were given for the unusual state of affairs. Usually this is the most productive season for eggs, marketmen said. Some were inclined to blame it on a greater consumer demand, due to high meat prices, others on the fact that more hens and chickens are being killed for meat, thus cutting off a big source of supply. Still others blame weather conditions, recent storms making pickups from farmers difficult. Another factor was said to be a smaller backlog of storage eggs than usual, with private holdings hereabouts being virtually cleaned out. Many hatcheries, generally closed at this season of the year, are said to be in operation, and this takes a large percentage of eggs away from the market.

Records show that not since December of 1919, just 31 years ago, have eggs been so high-priced in the month of December. At that time consumers were paying \$1 and sometimes more for a dozen eggs. It looks as if history is repeating itself.

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 8, 1950]

WHOLESALE EGG PRICES REACHED 30-YEAR HIGH IN CHICAGO YESTERDAY—RECORD CONSUMPTION RESPONSIBLE; TOP QUALITY EGGS MAY HIT \$1 A DOZEN IN NEW YORK

(By John A. McWethy)

CHICAGO.—Top quality eggs yesterday reached the highest wholesale price here since 1920.

They brought 72 cents a dozen. The big selling grade known in the trade as No. 2 extras climbed to 67 cents, up 3 cents from the previous day. A year ago they were 40 cents and as recently as October 10, when

the rise got under way, they were 48 cents.

In Chicago, these advances will mean you'll have to pay 85 cents a dozen for grade A eggs (No. 2 extras) in chain stores this week end, trade sources here say. The chains were charging around 80 cents for these eggs in Chicago yesterday. In New York, the same grade will move up to about 90 cents this week end and top quality eggs may sell in some New York stores for \$1 a dozen.

"Terrific consumption—more than anyone dreamed there would be—is the main reason for the price rise," one egg man here said. "Four weeks ago, I don't think there was an informed observer in the country who believed egg prices would go up. Almost everyone was looking for lower prices."

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION UP THIS YEAR

For all 1950, per capita consumption in the United States will average 384 eggs. At the moment, it's probably risen to a glutinous 390 to 400 a year rate, egg men here estimate. In 1949, consumption averaged 379 eggs per capita and prior to the war it was 298.

Why are people suddenly eating more eggs? The economist for a large food firm here says it probably reflects the war. People are earning more money and, with the country tooling up for war, they feel safe as far ahead as they can see. The same thing happened in 1942, he said.

This buying generates higher and higher prices until suddenly the housewife wakes up out of her trance and resists. Prices could turn down fast and it could happen any day.

On the supply side of the picture, production of eggs is running at about the same level as a year ago, produce men here say. But the movement of eggs from the country to terminal markets has been slowed down by snow storms which have blocked a number of country roads. Arrivals of eggs in Chicago, for example, were only 9,312 cases yesterday compared with 12,403 cases a week ago and 12,130 a year ago.

SNOWSTORMS NOT MAJOR FACTOR

Snowstorms, however, are a secondary rather than the major reason for the rise, egg men say. Prices were moving rapidly upward before the storms began.

Cold storage stocks of eggs are the lowest in history. This, too, has accentuated the rise. On December 1, there were only 71,000 cases of eggs in cold storage, a record low for that date. A year earlier, stocks totaled 250,000 cases. Were stocks larger, they would help cushion the effect of the sudden burst of appetite for eggs the public is showing.

Still another factor may be the rise in purchasing of eggs by the Army. Trade sources here say the military services are buying about 100 cars of eggs weekly now.

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 9, 1950]

Wholesale egg prices in Chicago climbed to the highest levels in 30 years. No. 2 Extras jumped 4 cents a dozen to 70 cents. A year ago they sold for 40 cents. Heavy consumer demand has been pushing these prices up since early October when they were around 48 cents. The further rise this week has been spurred by heavy snowstorms which blocked the flow of eggs to market. In Cincinnati, Procter & Gamble Co. raised wholesale prices of shortening and soap powders by 3½ percent.

[From the Washington Post of December 9, 1950]

PRICE OF GRADE A LARGE EGGS NEAR DOLLAR A DOZEN

The retail price of grade A large eggs was expected to push the dollar mark for a dozen in the District today.

A spokesman for the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association explained that a rise to 80 cents a dozen wholesale on the New York Mercantile Exchange yesterday would bring about a retail range here from 95 to 99 cents. Some retailers, however, were reportedly holding prices below 90 cents, at least for today.

The wholesale increase—14 cents a dozen since Monday in New York—was attributed to heavy buying by the armed services, curtailed transportation due to stormy weather, and a shortage of cold-storage eggs. The District's present "deficit market," with demand outstripping supply, forces wholesalers to pay New York prices for eggs produced in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, a spokesman said.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT CONTROL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to make a motion, with the understanding that if it leads to debate it will be withdrawn?

Mr. McCARRAN. Before doing so, let me inquire how the time now stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An hour and 50 minutes remains, divided between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator from West Virginia willing to agree that if consideration of his motion requires more than 5 minutes he will withdraw it?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly make that agreement with the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to make a motion out of order. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, subject to the agreement just made, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 209, Calendar 2588, to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended. This resolution was unanimously approved by the District of Columbia Committee. Except the brief extension requested, no change whatever is proposed in the existing law.

Mr. President, I know of no opposition to the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like very much to accommodate the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia, and no doubt will do so. However, I am wondering if the Senator from West Virginia will give us a little time to check the situation. There may be some Senators who are just as enthusiastic about the joint resolution as is the Senator from West Virginia, but who may wish to say something in behalf of the measure. I should like to have the opportunity to make a check. If the Senator will renew his motion immediately after the vote is taken on the pending business, or even before, if the managers will give the Senator the time, I shall be glad to answer "Yes" or "No." At this time I should like to have the Senator withhold the motion until I can make a check.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia withhold his motion?

Mr. NEELY. Very gladly, Mr. President.

EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like very much, if possible, to have the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in the Chamber. The reason is that some of my remarks are addressed to a colloquy which took place between the Senator from Oregon and myself on last Friday. If it is possible for him to be here, I should like to have him present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While the Senator from Oregon is being contacted, I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me to permit the clerk to read for the information of the Senate the 6-line amendment which I propose to offer. Since it has not been printed, I should like to give notice to Senators who may support or oppose the amendment, as to what it contains.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to its being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 7. This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended or obligated for expenditure for assistance to the Republic of China.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that Senators who are now present, but who were not present last Friday, may know the text of my amendment, I respectfully request that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5 through line 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The President is hereby authorized to expend not in excess of \$50,000,000 of the funds heretofore appropriated for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), for the purpose of providing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia under the authority of this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on Friday, when I submitted my amendment to the bill, I made reference to the economic position of the United Kingdom and its relation to Marshall-plan aid.

For the benefit of those interested, I desire to clarify my remarks so that they will not be misinterpreted. First, I want it clearly understood that I used the United Kingdom as the best example for

the purpose of demonstrating the recovery that has been had in Europe so that the use of the amount included in my amendment out of funds heretofore appropriated for the ECA will not adversely affect that program. I bring this information to the attention of the Senate, not by way of criticism, but in order that we may all more clearly understand the implication of our action.

During the period September 1949 through September 1950 the gold and dollar assets of the United Kingdom increased by the sum of \$1,331,000,000. During this same period, that is, September 1949 through September 1950, ECA has provided Marshall-plan assistance to the United Kingdom in the amount of \$768,000,000. By comparing these figures, it is a matter of simple arithmetic to see that a considerable portion of the aid that was furnished during this period was not actually required to finance import transactions, but was used to replace and increase the gold and dollar reserve supply of the United Kingdom.

I do not intend to argue that it is not good, or even necessary, that the United Kingdom have a large reserve of gold and dollars, maybe larger than its present gold and dollar reserve. However, the point I wish to make is that while her trade position is such as to balance her gold and dollar expenditures, it is rather foolish for us to provide dollars, which we have to raise by burdensome taxation or through borrowing, for the purpose of building up the gold and dollar reserve of the United Kingdom, it seems to me the pledge of the United States to the United Kingdom of our willingness to provide dollars if the drain on her gold and dollar reserves should become too great would serve to provide the necessary stability for the pound and would cost the American taxpayer considerably less. Certainly under present conditions that would be the case.

I think it should be recalled that the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States have had recent conversations aimed at reexamining the aid requirements of the United Kingdom and designed primarily to arrive at an understanding whereby further aid under the Marshall plan might not be considerably reduced, if not discontinued, during the remainder of this fiscal year.

I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that the object of these remarks has not been necessarily to criticize the United Kingdom, for she has made an excellent record in recovery, but rather they are designed to clarify my position that the diversion of funds heretofore appropriated for the Marshall plan to the purposes of the present legislation will not interfere with the Marshall-plan program.

Mr. President, I desire at this point to place in the RECORD a statement of the United Kingdom gold-and-dollar position.

As of September 1949 there was \$1,425,000,000, gold and dollars, in the British reserve.

As of September 1950 there was in the British reserve, gold and dollars, \$2,750,000,000.

The increase during the period was \$1,331,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator restate those figures please?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Gold and dollars as of September 1949, \$1,425,000,000.

Gold and dollars as of September 1950, \$2,756,000,000.

Increase during that period, \$1,331,000,000.

ECA procurement authorization during the same period was \$768,000,000.

Trade deficit during that period was \$235,000,000.

The amount of ECA funds in excess of trade requirements was \$563,000,000.

Mr. President, on Friday there was a colloquy between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself. I regret that the Senator is not present, because I have a high regard for his ability to discuss these subjects. During that colloquy I consented to give consideration over the week end to a modification of the amendment to make specific the understanding that \$12,000,000 of the \$50,000,000 authorized in my amendment was for the purpose of covering commitments already entered into by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

I have given this matter considerable thought and I believe that a clarification for the record is all that is necessary in this instance.

The stopgap program inaugurated by the Government up to the present totaled \$31,400,000. This sum was provided by the utilization of three different sources of funds. The Export-Import Bank loan provided \$5,600,000, the military assistance program provided \$13,600,000, and the ECA provided \$12,200,000. It is this latter fund with which my amendment is concerned.

Mr. President, I hope those present on the Senate floor will follow me closely in this matter because it is of vital importance.

The question has arisen as to the authority to commit ECA funds for this purpose. I must admit, Mr. President, that I am not satisfied as to the authority for this commitment, however, I should like to point out that up to date this is a morale commitment more than a legal one. Although an allotment has been made of ECA funds to Germany in the sum of approximately \$4,000,000, and a tentative allotment to Italy of an equivalent sum, the procurement authorizations which are in the final analysis the legal obligation of funds have not, I am informed, been issued by the ECA. These allotments are generally for information purposes and may be changed at any time prior to the issuance of a procurement authorization.

Therefore, in view of the doubt—and I entertain such doubt—as to the legal authority for such use of ECA funds, I felt that the authorization for further aid to Yugoslavia should include authorization for the use of the approximately \$12,000,000 heretofore morally committed. Since the legal authority for such action is in doubt, the Congress should make clear its intent lest the executive action in this case establish an

undesirable precedent for future use of ECA funds.

I make no comment with respect to the authority for the sums obligated from the military-assistance program or the Export-Import Bank loan, although as to that I have some grave doubts. I have been concerned in this matter chiefly with funds appropriated for the Marshall plan. I believe the record is clear, and that if this amendment is adopted as it is presently proposed the intent will be well established that of the total sum of \$50,000,000 authorized to be used out of the ECA appropriation, \$12,000,000 of such authorization is to cover the moral commitment heretofore entered into by our Government.

Mr. President, I do say to the ECA Administrator that while we feel there is a moral obligation which we will cover in this instance, we do not want it to become a precedent, and that he may turn down such a request if it should ever come up again.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I noted what the Senator had to say about the Export-Import Bank. That action disturbed and disquieted some of us a very great deal because, so far as I was able to learn, it is a precedent in respect to that sort of thing. The Export-Import Bank was created for quite another purpose, and has always operated quite carefully to confine itself to what was certainly the spirit and intent of the law. But if we pass this over now, and it is indicated that our action is being established as a precedent, it might get us very far afield in going into various ventures of this character. Is there any way that we could effectively indicate what seems to be the position of the Senator from Nevada that this is not a precedent for a course to be followed hereafter?

Mr. McCARRAN. As regards the item that came from the Export-Import Bank, I said I had grave doubts as to its legality, because I do not think the Export-Import Bank was established with that object in view.

As to the \$12,000,000 from ECA which was used in this connection, I have even more grave doubts about the legality of the right to use those funds. However, that money was used and now the executive branch is morally committed. It was done in the following manner: Germany and Italy furnished flour to Yugoslavia. Now the executive branch has committed itself to furnish grain to Germany and Italy, to take the place of that flour. So it is a moral commitment which I do not wish to do away with entirely, but I say to the Senate that it should not be established as a precedent. I say we should frown on it and should continue to frown on it. If those in the executive branch wish to do these things, they should first come to the Congress and obtain authority for them.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the case of military assistance, was there not perhaps some greater warrant within the scope of the executive authority?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is there anything in the measure now before the Senate which, at any rate, would clearly put the Congress on record as not in any way condoning this departure from what we understand to be the spirit and the letter of the law?

Mr. McCARRAN. I had hoped, and I continue to hope, that perhaps my remarks and the remarks of other Senators on this subject, expressed on the floor of the Senate, will be a signboard to those who hereafter will administer it.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the next appropriation for the ECA comes before us, will it be appropriate to consider at that time making some clear indication that further ventures of this character are not to be encouraged?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it would be, but I do not know whether that would reach the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course, that is a matter of their loans. The Export-Import Bank does not come to us for appropriations, does it?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; the Export-Import Bank makes loans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at the moment I do not know of any other Senator who wishes to speak.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I have had read at the desk. I should like to call the amendment to the attention of the Senator from Texas, in the hope that he may be able to accept it. If he does accept it, I intend to support the Yugoslavia aid bill.

The amendment is very brief, comprising only six lines, which read as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"Sec. 7. This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended or obligated for expenditure for assistance to the Republic of China."

Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Texas that I was in the Senate Chamber at the time when the original unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, prior to which there was a quorum call, in accordance with the general understanding. That unanimous-consent agreement dealt with the railway labor bill. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, I left the Senate Chamber, because in the Armed Services Committee we had been holding hearings on the Rosenberg appointment.

Sometime later—and the proceedings appear 14 pages later in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, namely, on page 16351, whereas the original unanimous-consent agreement proceedings appear on page 16337—we find that the original unanimous-consent agreement was amended, without having a quorum call in advance; and as thus amended the agreement takes in an entirely different piece

of proposed legislation, namely, the Yugoslavia aid bill.

I would feel that I had been foreclosed from a right in connection with the bill if the question of germaneness is raised against my amendment, because my understanding of the germaneness provision is that the purpose is primarily to prevent FEPC proposed legislation from being tacked on to a bill which has no relationship to FEPC.

This amendment is one with which I have been concerned for some time. If this amendment and the other amendments which have been proposed are adopted, I shall be perfectly willing to support the Yugoslavia aid bill, because I think it is important to break Yugoslavia away from the Soviet bloc, if that can be done.

However, I also feel that some of us who previously have supported proposed legislation to give aid to the Republic of China, and then found that only an infinitesimal amount of the funds appropriated by the Congress for that purpose had been used for that purpose, have a right to bring up that matter by way of proposed legislation of this kind.

For that reason, I should like to have a few minutes to discuss the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall have to make a point of order against the amendment, on the ground that it is not germane to the original bill.

I do not object to the Senator's having time to debate the amendment, if he desires to do so; but I reserve the right to make the point of order later. I do not wish to make it now if the Senator from California wishes to debate the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, then, at least, I should like to have some time to discuss the amendment.

If the point I have raised does not receive consideration, namely, that I was foreclosed from offering this amendment by entering into a modification of the unanimous-consent agreement—for which modification a quorum call was not had before the modification, which greatly broadens the scope of the unanimous-consent agreement relative to the railway-labor bill, by including the offering of the Yugoslavia-aid bill, was entered into—then, Mr. President, when the next piece of proposed legislation comes before the Senate, I shall be prepared to offer the amendment as a rider to be attached to that measure, and shall accompany that offer with the statement that I was foreclosed from doing so at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot object now to what the Senator from California may do with respect to the next bill, but I can do so with respect to this bill. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement.

It seems to me that the question the Senator from California raises as to whether there was a quorum call is foreclosed by reason of the action of the Senate. Advantage would have to have been taken of that at the moment when the proposed agreement was before the Senate; some Senator would have had

to suggest that a quorum was not present.

However, if a unanimous-consent agreement is obtained without having a reservation of that kind, a quorum call is foreclosed; a month later a Senator cannot object to the agreement on the ground that a quorum call was not had at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope that in the future both the majority and the minority leadership will protect the Members of the Senate who are absent from the floor of the Senate in the discharge of their obligations, by seeing to it that if a unanimous-consent agreement is broadened to include another matter, a quorum call is had first.

In this case, the Senate had entered into a unanimous-consent agreement relative to the further proceedings in regard to the railway labor bill, an important piece of proposed legislation with which every American is concerned. Then we find, as appears 14 pages later in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—thus indicating that an appreciable amount of time must have elapsed during that period—that a modification of the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, and as a result some of us have been foreclosed from offering an amendment of this kind, which I think is vital in the field of foreign relations.

The Senator from Texas has made his point of order, and thus has foreclosed me from offering the amendment, if that is the ruling of the Chair.

However, at least I should like to have time to speak on the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to give the Senator time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the ruling of the Chair, because the point of order has not yet been made; and the Chair cannot rule on a point of order until it is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. When the agreement was originally entered into, I was not on the floor of the Senate. When I arrived on the floor, I found that the only issue which had been resolved was that a vote would be taken at 4 o'clock today on the Yugoslavia aid bill. It was then that I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Texas and to other Senators who then were on the floor that if other amendments were to be offered, and I did that to try to modify a request which already had been entered into, additional time should be given—for instance, 20 minutes in total on each amendment, with 10 minutes for each side; and I said that the usual provisions with respect to unanimous-consent agreements should be entered into. By that I meant that in order to accommodate those on the other side of the aisle, the usual provision with respect to germaneness, which in this case has to do with civil-rights measures, and which provision is always included in such agreements, should be written into the agreement.

It was not my intention then, nor is it now, that under that understanding, which was rather a gentlemen's understanding among us, any Senator would

be foreclosed from offering an amendment having to do with the proposed Yugoslavia aid legislation or with other measures pertaining thereto.

Because of the fact that a quorum call should have been had at that time—there is no doubt about that, because at that time we were attempting to modify a unanimous-consent agreement already entered into—I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will permit the Senator from California to offer his amendment, and then let us have a vote on it.

I am satisfied that if the Senator from California had been on the floor of the Senate at the time when the modification of the agreement was proposed, he would have objected unless it was agreed that he could offer this amendment. Certainly, since it has nothing to do with civil rights, it has a place here for consideration. I shall deeply appreciate it if the distinguished Senator from Texas will permit the Senator from California to offer the amendment, particularly in view of what was said after the unanimous-consent request had been agreed to, in which deliberations I had no part.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska says the Senator from California was not present. That is true. But the Senator from Nebraska was present, and he should have asked the Senate to observe the requirement of a quorum call then, not now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will recall, I was not present when the original unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was present on the subsequent occasion.

Mr. WHERRY. Not until I rose, after the agreement had been made, to ask whether we could not have a modification of the agreement to include amendments which might be offered, instead of confining it merely to a vote on the one amendment regarding which there was a unanimous-consent agreement. I feel sure the distinguished Senator remembers that. It was late in the afternoon. I suggested that we could get a vote on additional amendments, if the usual procedure were followed of allowing 20 minutes for debate on each amendment, 10 minutes to a side. I stated it was my feeling that we ought to modify the unanimous-consent agreement which had previously been made, and the distinguished Senator from Texas, because of his thoughtfulness and interest, agreed to that. When that was done, it was my intention that any germane amendment could be offered, unless it had something to do with the civil-rights measure, and a provision as to germaneness is always included in a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CONNALLY. However, it is necessary that we proceed according to what the record shows, not according to what may be in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Nebraska is not always present. He has pointed out that he was not present on a previous occasion. If we are to go out in

search of the Senator from Nebraska, to learn what is in his mind, that is one thing. If we are to proceed according to the record made in the Senate, that is another thing. I do not wish to be either hostile or contrary. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from California may have such time as he may need in order to discuss the amendment. I do not think the amendment is germane, and, that being so, it becomes my duty to oppose it. I shall therefore make the point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California had no desire to delay action by the Senate on the Yugoslavia relief bill. I felt that an amendment of this kind was germane to the general subject matter with which we were dealing. There is a difference of opinion about that, and perhaps the precedents and the rulings will sustain the technical objection made by the Senator from Texas. However, since the unanimous-consent agreement did not provide a final hour for voting on the bill itself, but merely on the amendments, the Senator from California may find it necessary to move to recommit, with instructions to the committee to report back the amendment which I have offered. Since there is no hour set for a final vote on the bill, that amendment might be in order. I do not want to be compelled to proceed in the way I have indicated if we can get a straight vote on the amendment prior to that time, but in my opinion it is so important that, if I am foreclosed from having a vote on the amendment, I should then feel it necessary at least to exhaust whatever parliamentary rights were still left to me under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from California that he will have plenty of opportunity in connection with other measures to offer his amendment. The Yugoslavia relief measure relates to our foreign affairs. If the Senator from California could have heard the discussions in committee I am sure he would not have offered this amendment. It is of vital importance that the pending bill be passed, and that it be passed promptly. It affects, I think, what is usually in the mind of the Senator from California; that is, it is an anti-Communist move. The Senator's proposal, which would tie this up with the Chinese situation, would result in interminable debate not germane to the subject of aid to Yugoslavia. I must, therefore, insist on the point of order, although I shall be glad to withhold it temporarily if the Senator wants to discuss it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time is yielded to the Senator from California, and by whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have 15 minutes, if possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from

Texas. Does either Senator yield time to the Senator from California, and if so, how much?

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest that the Senator from Texas and I each yield 7½ minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the history of the arms implementation legislation, insofar as it provided the appropriation of \$75,000,000. We were then meeting as a joint committee, composed of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. I supported the arms implementation legislation for Europe and for the other countries which were included. We had before the committee testimony relative to the Republic of China, and during those hearings Admiral Badger, who has represented the United States Government in command of the fleet in the Far East, appeared before the committee to testify.

The original amendment which I had submitted for aid to the Republic of China, had provided, according to my recollection, for \$100,000,000 or \$125,000,000. Suggestions had been made that it be cut to \$50,000,000. When Admiral Badger was before the committee, the question was asked him, "What in your judgment is the minimum amount necessary to give some effective aid to the Republic of China?" He answered, "\$75,000,000." That is the legislative background with respect to the origin of the figure of \$75,000,000.

There was still quite a bit of discussion and controversy in committee, however, as to what aid, if any, should be given the Republic of China. As a result of a compromise suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the language was used "in the general area of China," and it was pointed out that in the event it was not feasible to give aid to the Republic of China, as such, it might be feasible to have the language so drawn that aid could be given to southeast Asia or other sections, if that were necessary. I had no objection to the compromise proposal. It made sense. No one knew, in this changing world, exactly what the conditions might be.

The fact is, however, that of the original \$75,000,000 allocated to the Republic of China, and which was a clear congressional intent that it should go to the Republic of China, an infinitesimal amount was used, if any. The bill was again amended when it came up this year. In the second arms implementation bill, the \$75,000,000 was again included. There was a slight change in the language, which permitted the President to expend about half of those funds without accounting for them to Congress. But again the general intent was that it should be spent on "the general area of China," and certainly many of us who supported it felt that one of the chief reasons for its being included was in order to aid the Republic of China.

Mr. President, I think I am realistic enough to recognize that there is value in breaking Yugoslavia away from the Communist satellite states, and under proper safeguards I certainly have no objection to, and would like to support, any move which would tend to break down the solid front of the Kremlin. But I should like to call attention to the fact that one of the great difficulties in the foreign policy which we have followed has been the fact that we did not recognize that communism was a global menace, that it was no less menacing in Asia than in Europe.

I have supported the arms implementation program, the North Atlantic Pact, the Greek-Turkish aid program, and ECA, because I felt that they were contributions toward closing the door to communism in Europe. Where I have differed with the administration has been in the fact that while we were closing the door in Europe, we were leaving it wide open in Asia. The fact of the matter is that on the island of Formosa today there exists a legal government of the Republic of China, a nation with which we have had friendly relations for a period of a hundred years. The Republic of China was our war-time ally in two wars. They are permanent members of the Security Council. They are charter members of the United Nations. I have visited the island of Formosa twice. They have complete religious freedom. They have a fine educational system. The American press is freely admitted. There is no censorship; there is no persecution of anyone because of his religion or color. That is the record of Nationalist China.

In addition to that, they have more than 600,000 non-Communist troops, which is a larger body of non-Communist armed forces than exist in all the rest of Asia together, including the troops of India, Pakistan, the Philippine Republic, the Indonesian Republic, the British in Malaya and Hong Kong, the French in Indo-China, the Korean army, and the United States forces in Korea.

It does not make sense, Mr. President, to begin to aid the Communist Government of Yugoslavia, albeit that government has broken from the Kremlin, when we neglect to give infinitesimal aid to the Government of the Republic of China which is non-Communist in character and which is protecting our far-eastern flank. The fact of the matter is that the Republic of China has never shot down American planes, and Yugoslavia has done so. The Republic of China has voted with the free nations in the United Nations on the question of the Korean invasion, a hundred percent of the time. If Senators will examine the record of Yugoslavia, they will find that it has supported the free nations of the world a very small fraction of the time in the matter of the Korean invasion.

There is complete religious freedom in the Republic of China on the island of Formosa. That does not exist in Yugoslavia.

As I pointed out to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am

perfectly willing, if, in the judgment of the administration, it is necessary in the interests of our national defense to give some aid to Communist Yugoslavia, in the general interest of the world-wide situation which exists, to give such aid, but I say, Mr. President, at the same time that we should no longer ignore the mandate of the Congress, both in connection with authorization legislation and appropriations, which indicated that the Congress of the United States at least thought it was equally important to give aid to the non-Communist Republic of China.

If I am foreclosed from offering this amendment, Mr. President, by a technical point of order which forecloses me from exercising in part my duties as a United States Senator, I want to serve notice now that upon the third reading of the bill I intend to move to recommit it to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions that in the bill which is reported thereafter there be a provision similar to that which I am offering as an amendment. If that is done, I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will very promptly take up the bill and report it with the amendment which I have offered; and at that time I shall be prepared to support the bill for aid to Communist Yugoslavia which has broken with the Kremlin, but also for aid to Nationalist China which has never been Communist and which has consistently supported the United States and the United Nations in the matter of aggression in Korea.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I join the Senator from California wholeheartedly. I stand behind what he has said and will support his motion if it comes before the Senate. I regret that a point of order should be invoked against the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I have no confidence in the present Yugoslav Government. I have no idea that the Government of that nation is serious in its break with its political parent. I have no idea that Mr. Tito has any remorse for what he has done politically and religiously or in any other way. I regret that it may be necessary to do what we are proposing to do here by way of lending aid. But I certainly regret more that we should deny immediate aid to Nationalist China, which is now isolated, in part, on the island of Formosa. If we had given some aid—not very much, but some aid—to Nationalist China when it had a solid foothold on the continent of Asia, in my judgment, American boys would not be dying in Korea today. But we did not do that, although some of us were urging that a few officers be sent over there to guide the military maneuvers of Chiang Kai-shek and to assist the Nationalist Chinese Army in setting itself up against the hordes of communism that were being guided by the Kremlin. But that was not done. It is now water over the wheel, and there is no use in complaining about what has passed. It is the future and the present to which we must look.

In my judgment, there is much merit in the amendment to be offered by the

Senator from California, and I shall support him in every way if the amendment comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, so far as I am aware, there is no other Senator who cares to be heard with reference to the amendment which I have offered, and I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we cannot vote on any amendments until 4 o'clock.

Mr. McCARRAN. I so understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I say to the Senator from Nevada, who says this amendment should be voted on, that the bill itself was carefully considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee had testimony from outsiders, from the State Department, and from members of the committee, so that we understand it thoroughly. Why cannot the amendment of the Senator from California go through the same route? Let him submit it to some committee, let that committee consider it and hold hearings, and then report it. Why do we have to railroad this particular amendment of the Senator from California by recommitting the whole bill, in order that he may try to take a course which is against the standard rules of the Senate? I do not want to be in any wise lacking in consideration. I gladly yielded time to the Senator from California to make his speech. But that does not mean that I care to see the rules of the Senate violated and the unanimous-consent agreement ignored in order to railroad through some proposal which is contrary to the purpose and intent of this particular bill.

As I stated a while ago, we considered this bill thoroughly in the committee. All Senators are aware of the break between Tito and the Cominform. The testimony revealed that the Yugoslav Government and the people are gradually coming more and more around to the viewpoint of the West. The testimony further is that Yugoslavia has suffered the worst drought in the history of any living person in that country. The testimony is that most of the supplies will be from the United States.

So, Mr. President, from all the considerations, in view of the fact that the committee favorably reported the bill, I very much hope that it will be passed without any undue delay. I realize that we cannot vote until 4 o'clock, and I am not adverse to any Senator who wants to discuss the question having the time in which to do so. I shall gladly yield any such time out of my allotment as is desirable and necessary.

It is now 3 o'clock, and we cannot vote until 4 o'clock. I do not know who put that provision into the agreement. I think it is very unwise to provide that the Senate cannot vote until such and such an hour. I think it is important to vote when we conclude the discussion. I should be willing to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada which the committee has indicated it is willing to accept.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not holding up a vote until 4 o'clock. I am ready to vote now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we are not able to vote until 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator from Nevada to yield some time to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood that the Senator from Texas would surrender the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I shall. What does the Senator desire to ask me?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am permitted to yield time now, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Neither do I wish to discuss the merits of the so-called McCarran amendment. I wish to make some observations on unanimous-consent requests.

The distinguished Senator from Texas has stated that it is 3 o'clock, and we cannot vote now because under the unanimous-consent agreement we agreed not to vote until 4 o'clock. He said he did not know why anyone should make such an agreement. Mr. President, to begin with, I was not on the floor when the original agreement was entered into. I was here when some modifications were made. However, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that in my opinion the only way it is possible to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement—and I think properly so—is by having a definite time stated in the agreement when a vote is to be taken. The reason for such an understanding as to time for voting is to permit Senators to plan to be in attendance at such time. If such an agreement as to time were not made some Senators would find it impossible to be present when a vote was taken.

I believe the practice we have followed in that respect is good. I believe it has met with the approval of almost all Senators. When a definite time for taking a vote is fixed in a unanimous-consent agreement, Senators can plan in advance to be present when such a vote is taken. Therefore, there can be no complaint on the part of any Senator about not being able to be present. So far as I am concerned, on the basis of the experience I have had with such agreements, I believe it is the only way in which a unanimous-consent agreement can be entered into.

Mr. President, I should like to say also that a unanimous-consent agreement expedites the work of the Senate. Very often such an agreement saves a considerable amount of time. Sometimes debate runs out before we reach the hour fixed for a vote. However, that happens very seldom. In my opinion—and Sena-

tors who are my senior will agree with me, I think—ofttimes a unanimous-consent agreement tends to terminate or limit debate to a great extent, thus enabling the Senate to do other constructive work. Therefore, I think it is a good thing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement on which all Senators are agreed.

The third point I wish to make is that I am satisfied the Senator from California has made a perfect case relative to procedure in connection with the present unanimous-consent agreement, namely, that under the circumstances there should have been a quorum call. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] insists on a quorum call even when a unanimous-consent agreement is proposed on an important amendment—and I think rightly so—because oftentimes a Senator is attending to important committee work and is not able to be on the floor to protest. Usually, in the judgment of the minority leader, it is good practice to have a quorum call when a unanimous-consent agreement is proposed, even on an amendment. On occasions I have taken pains to call Senators who I thought would be interested in certain amendments and have asked them whether or not it met with their approval to have a unanimous-consent agreement entered into with respect to an amendment.

I was not present the other day when the original unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. If I had been present I would have requested a quorum call, because the agreement includes a provision with respect to a vote on the final passage of the bill. I have tried to follow that procedure since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have always felt that a quorum call should precede that kind of unanimous-consent agreement. It is true that I should have been here, but I will leave it to my colleagues to decide whether or not I have not been present in the Chamber as much as any Senator can be expected to be present and at the same time carry on the other work of the Senate, as well as my duties as minority leader. As I say, I was not here when the original agreement was entered into, but the Senator who sat in my chair—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 5 minutes allotted to me. However, I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. At the moment members of the Committee on Appropriations are expected to attend a meeting of the committee. If we are attending such a meeting downstairs, it is impossible to agree to any unanimous-consent agreement that may be offered in our absence. There are approximately only a half-dozen Senators on the floor at the present time. I for one feel we should have a quorum call. I would like to submit an amendment to the pending measure. I believe the Senator from Texas is technically correct. However, in the future I wish such procedure as the Senator from Nebraska suggests

could be followed. I know that unanimous consent was given in this instance, and the Senator from Texas is therefore correct. However, in the future under such circumstances we should have a quorum call. I should like to submit an amendment with reference to Spain, inasmuch as we are about to take care of the hungry people of Yugoslavia. There are other places in the world that should be taken care of, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. May I have additional time?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad to yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his observations. He has had long experience in the Senate. He knows how important it is to expedite the work of the Senate. I know that when we approach the end of a session late in the evening the tendency is not to have a quorum call. However, it is my opinion that before agreements to vote are entered we should have a quorum call on important amendments, and as well as on the passage of a bill.

I have not had lunch, and there is a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations which I should like to attend.

The other day when I came to the Chamber during the discussion of the unanimous-consent agreement I asked that the consent agreement be modified, because I thought additional amendments might be offered. My statement in that respect is found in the colloquy following the unanimous-consent request. I requested that if additional amendments were offered 20 minutes be allowed for a discussion of each amendment, with 10 minutes allotted to each side. I made such request in order to protect Senators who may wish to offer additional amendments. I thought it would protect the rights of Senators who were not present at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. I made the request in good faith.

I also requested that the question of the germaneness of an amendment be included in the modified agreement. I was merely protecting the rights of those who would have objected if such a modification had not been included. I did not think for a moment that with the insertion of a provision requiring germaneness, thus barring any amendment which dealt with civil rights any Senator would be deprived of the opportunity of offering any other amendment appropriate to the bill, in view of the fact that the hour for a vote on the bill was stated in the agreement and the time for debate was to be limited to 20 minutes on each amendment. I have the very highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Texas, and he was very cooperative in arriving at the unanimous-consent agreement, and at what I would call the amended amend-

ment to it. He agreed to it. A few moments ago he said that he had to protect the rights of Senators.

Of course, technically if a Senator wishes to raise the question of germaneness, he has the right to do so. That right exists with respect to any amendment. We could debate the issue, and we could accept, or not, the interpretation of the Presiding Officer with respect to it. However, that does not foreclose a method of procedure by which it would be possible to get a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Personally I would deeply appreciate it, in view of the situation and the effect it would have on obtaining future unanimous-consent agreements, if the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in line with the observations made by the Senator from California, would permit his amendment to be considered, with the understanding that debate on it would be limited to 20 minutes, with 10 minutes allotted to each side, and that a vote on it be then taken. If the Senator from Texas would agree to such procedure, it would preserve the rights of all Senators, and I am satisfied that in the future it would not create difficulty on getting unanimous-consent agreements. Otherwise, if we are to rely on technicalities we may be forced to see to it that a quorum call is had under similar circumstances, and great care in that respect would have to be exercised. It may be that Senators who are today relying on technicalities will be the first to say, "Let us waive this right. It is not important. Let us expedite the work of the Senate."

I hope and pray that the distinguished Senator from Texas will allow this amendment to be considered under a 20-minute limitation, and permit a vote to be taken on it. If we can do so, it will help the unanimous-consent procedure, and there will not be any hesitancy about continuing to enter into unanimous-consent agreements. Otherwise, those who are responsible will be forced to see to it that the rules are strictly interpreted with reference to unanimous-consent requests.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for giving me time. I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will agree that it is the proper procedure to expedite the work of the Senate to give us an opportunity to vote on the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in response to the urgent language of the Senator from Nebraska, I yield such time as is necessary to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations. I think the chairman is entirely correct, for this reason; we had no hearings whatever on this proposal. It was not suggested to the committee at all during the hearings. No member of the committee offered an amendment of this kind. That includes the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who, I am sure, is sympathetic to this idea. In fact, no amendment dealing with this subject was considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just a moment.

Under the normal procedures, proposals which have not been considered in committee are not usually accepted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that point, will he yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure about this, but I am asking for information. Was the amendment of the Senator from Nevada considered by the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that on Friday before the Senate took a recess the committee was perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada is not a matter of substance at all. It deals only with the procedure of making the money available. It does not go to anything of substance. On the other hand, here we have an entirely new subject matter introduced, a matter which I think the Parliamentarian will have to hold is not germane. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada is in no sense comparable to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is far-reaching. It is my opinion that if there were an unexpended balance the Senator's amendment would provide not only the authority, but the appropriations in the same amendment. If the McCarran amendment is adopted, if there is an unexpended balance the effect of the amendment will be not only to authorize, but to appropriate. That is pretty far-reaching. That is a pretty important amendment as a precedent for the future. I submit to the Senate that if the McCarran amendment was not presented to the committee, committee members should not complain that the amendment of the Senator from California was not submitted to the committee. Both amendments should follow the same procedure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I see no analogy and no similarity whatever between the substance of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada and the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know that the Senator wants to be fair in this situation, as he always is.

In the first place, the amendment which I have offered neither authorizes new funds nor appropriates new funds. Both legislative committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committee, have already twice passed upon the subject, and the Committee on Appropriations has already twice passed upon the question of appropriations. So the amendment would not provide any new money. It

would merely ask the executive branch to carry out the intent of Congress. So the question has had legislative consideration.

Secondly, I do not believe that even the able Senator from Arkansas would maintain that the United States Senate, consisting of 96 Members, should surrender all its legislative prerogatives into the hands of any 13-member committee. I speak as a member of the Armed Services Committee. I would not expect to foreclose amendments from the floor by Senators other than those who are members of the Armed Services Committee. That question goes to the heart of the subject of legislation.

Each of us has an obligation not only to the entire United States, but to our States. The fact of the matter is that there are vast areas in this country which are not even represented on the Foreign Relations Committee. So we must not take the position that 96 Senators are foreclosed from offering amendments to a bill, and that we must merely rubber-stamp anything which any Senate committee reports to this body. On reflection, I do not believe that the Senate can accept any such doctrine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the authorization of \$75,000,000 was not made under existing conditions. As I recall, there was discretion for its use in the general area of China. The conditions which have arisen in the past few weeks, or the past 6 months, from one point of view have altered our relations in the Far East very substantially. I believe that a proposal of this kind should be considered very seriously.

I am slightly acquainted with some of the speeches of the Senator from California. I am not prepared to say that I agree or disagree finally with his views about what our foreign policy should be with regard to China. I think it is an extremely serious question. I would not want to do anything which might seem to commit us to a war with the existing Communist regime in China. At the moment I am inclined to think that that would be a disastrous policy. Whatever may have been done prior to the recent developments with regard to China, I think that question—to use a term to which I do not object—should be re-examined in view of recent developments. I do not believe that we ought to take precipitate action in a matter of this kind. I do not say that I would definitely oppose such action. I think that our action should be consistent with the position of the best minds we have, both military and civilian. I do not believe that the committee or the Senate, without any hearings and without having consulted our leaders in the military and civilian fields, should take such action as is proposed, which certainly could be subject to being interpreted as an overt act toward the reopening of the active intervention or active warfare between Chiang Kai-shek's forces and those of Red China. The position at the moment is an extremely delicate one. I do not wish to commit myself today. I do not believe that I know exactly what I think is the wisest thing to do; but the wrong thing to do is

for the Senate, without ever having examined the question, and without having the benefit of any advice from our executive department, to take such action. That is the only point I make. The amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the measure under consideration, and I do not think it ought to be passed at this time. I see no reason why the Senator from California cannot this afternoon introduce a bill which would go to the committee, where it would be immediately subjected to study. I do not say that I would be against the proposal. I am against it being adopted in this fashion, without any hearings and without any advice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the President would say about it as of this moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator know that 2 years ago the Senator from California submitted a resolution in which he requested that consideration be given to an examination of the entire far eastern policy? The resolution was referred to the Senator's committee, but no hearing was ever held on it. Does the Senator know that this amendment was introduced in the committee in the belief—and I believe there was fair reason for the belief—that funds in substantial part would be used for the help of the Republic of China? For 2 years, with two different amounts of \$75,000,000 authorized and appropriated, an infinitesimal amount, if any, has been spent. That is the reason why the Senator from California feels that it is necessary to proceed in this way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I have tried to point out, whatever may have been done 6 months, a year, or 2 years ago is not very pertinent to what we ought to do in the immediate difficulties which confront us. We did a number of things back in those days we might not want to do now. I certainly think that what has been suggested by the Senator from California is a matter we ought to examine with a view to determining just how far we desire to go.

I believe the Senator from California stated on the floor that we ought to advance and help in every way attacks by Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Red China, and so on. That may turn out to be our policy; but it is not our policy as yet. I must say that I am very fearful of becoming involved in China, whereas our real enemy is not China at all. That is the secondary enemy. The primary enemy is in Moscow, as the Senator knows, and the inspiration for all these moves in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in Europe, comes from Moscow.

Mr. President, I do not believe our objectives are different at all. We may disagree as to what is the most effective way to reach the objectives. I know the Senator from California is just as sincere and anxious to promote the safety

and preserve the integrity of this country as I am, but there is always room for legitimate differences as to the best way to accomplish that objective. That is the only difference between us.

We are in a period when very difficult decisions must be made. As I have tried to say on one or two occasions, this is a time when as respects both Houses of Congress and the Executive, there is no longer room for personalities, when we must close ranks, and try to develop some kind of concrete action in the near future.

In my opinion, the worst thing that could happen would be the creation of the impression, either in the minds of our allies or in the minds of our enemies, that we were all torn up, that we did not know what we were about, that we were fighting among ourselves. I think we have got to compose our differences.

The Senator says he has sent several amendments or bills of a similar nature to the committee. I do not recall—and, of course, the Senator from California knows that I do not set the agenda of that committee—why such a bill was not considered or reported.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to observe that I did not become a member of the Foreign Relations Committee until the Eighty-first Congress, and I know the Senator from Arkansas became a member of the committee during the Eighty-first Congress. I am sure the Senator will remember that during the late spring of 1949 we spent days and weeks in reviewing the situation in the Far East, listening to the testimony of military men, listening to the testimony of Navy men, and of the State Department, and in obtaining all the information we could get with relation to the far-eastern situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. It was the full committee which heard that testimony. The testimony was not given in executive meeting, and the majority of the committee certainly did not exclude the minority. I can remember very well our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who, unfortunately, is not with us now because of illness, being present at those meetings. I can remember the active part he took during those deliberations. It may be true, as the Senator from California said, that he did not secure a hearing on his specific proposal, but that there was not a very thoroughgoing review of the Chinese situation, and the oriental situation I think is contradicted by the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for reminding me of the hearings on the far-eastern situation. I do recall now that we went over the whole program very carefully. Particularly I recall that the Korean ECA situation was discussed and rediscussed. As a matter of fact, at that time, as the Senator will recall, I moved to cut the Korean appropriation to \$50,000,000, from \$150,000,000. We also discussed the area of the Chinese appropriation. I do not think it ever was spe-

cifically for the Republic of China. Discretion was left to the Executive to use the appropriation in that general area.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for an observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I invite the Senator's attention and the Senate's attention to the report, under the caption "The main purpose of the bill":

This assistance, most of which will be in the form of food, is being provided in order to assist the Yugoslav people to avoid economic havoc arising out of unusual drought conditions during 1950 and thereby to maintain their independence from the Soviet Union which can be expected to do its utmost to encourage the disintegration of an independent Yugoslavia.

This is emergency legislation, as I understand the report of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. So, it ought to be passed with all convenient speed. Yet when we read the amendment offered by the able Senator from California we find:

This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended or obligated for expenditure for assistance to the Republic of China.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from California is adopted, then, before we can do anything for Yugoslavia, it will be necessary to carry out the conditions set forth in the amendment of the Senator from California. The Senate well knows that the State Department, which will have the power to do what the Senator from California expects to be done by his amendment, is not going to expend \$38,000,000 for some time, and it is not going to obligate that sum for some time. If the State Department has to go into this phase of the program at this particular time, I undertake to say that it will be probably many, many days before the Department finally determines how it is going to obligate the \$38,000,000; therefore, the result of the amendment will be to defeat the very program the Senate of the United States is seeking to put through.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make one observation before yielding. I appreciate the contribution by the majority leader. Obviously, adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from California would cause considerable delay in putting into effect the proposed legislation which is under consideration. Even with the best of good will, the expenditure and obligation of the funds would necessarily take a substantial time. It is important that the food be made available to Yugoslavia prior to the next crop year. That is when the real crisis will come in Yugoslavia. I believe the testimony was that it would be reached along in February, March, and April. If we now get into a controversy over the matter involved in the amendment of the Senator from California, it is obvious that it will take longer than that actually to obligate this substantial amount of funds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit, I should like to place in the RECORD section 303 of title 3 of Public Law 329, Eighty-first Congress, and also section 8, which relates to section 303, of Public Law 621, of the Eighty-first Congress, second session, which relates to the \$75,000,000 fund.

There being no objection, the sections referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 303. In consideration of the concern of the United States in the present situation in China, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$75,000,000 in addition to funds otherwise provided as an emergency fund for the President, which may be expended to accomplish in that general area the policies and purposes declared in this act. Certification by the President of the amounts expended out of funds authorized hereunder, and that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of such expenditures, shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amounts expended.

SEC. 8. Section 303 of such act is hereby amended by designating such section as subsection (a) and by adding thereto subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts heretofore authorized to be appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$75,000,000, to be used as provided in subsection (a) of this section, of which not more than \$35,000,000 may be accounted for as therein provided and any amount accounted for in such manner shall, with the exception of \$7,500,000, be reported to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas first, if he does not recognize that what the amendment seeks has been authorized by Congress not only once but on two occasions, so that under the Knowland amendment all that is necessary is an administrative act by the executive branch of the Government to carry out the intent of Congress.

The second point is that the full needs of the Republic of China have been carefully surveyed by a group which was in the Republic of China, and received the figures from the Government of the Republic, that those figures have been sent on from the Far East to the Government of the United States, and have been in Washington for at least 2 months; so that, so far as surveying the needs is concerned, all the necessary information is presently available in the hands of the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he interprets the language appropriating the \$75,000,000 as meaning that this money must be given to or spent upon the Republic of China, that is General Chiang Kai-shek's government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I will say, as I explained, I think before the Senator came into the Chamber, that the legislative history of it was that the first amendment I submitted provided the aid specifically for the Republic of China consisting of about \$125,000,000. We had a considerable discussion in the combined committee. There was some objection to giving the Republic of China anything. There were some who wanted to give less, and some who wanted to give the Republic of China more. We had Admiral Badger before us. We questioned him on the needs of the Republic of China. I believe the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] or one of the other members of the combined committees had asked, "Cannot we agree upon \$10,000,000?" That question was put to Admiral Badger. His testimony was that the minimum amount they would need in order to do any kind of a job for the Republic of China was \$75,000,000. That is the legislative history of the figure \$75,000,000.

The committee was still in dispute. Finally the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] suggested, so that we could make a unanimous report of the combined committees, the language "in the general area of China." The argument was made—and quite properly, I think—that we could not be certain that the Republic of China would still be in existence when the funds were provided; perhaps the Republic of China would have been overwhelmed by that time.

So, in order to provide some flexibility to the administration in the use of the funds, so that they would be available perhaps in southeast Asia or elsewhere in the vicinity of China, we agreed upon that language. None of us thought China would be excluded in that situation or that the funds would be put into a deep freeze, so that they could not be used to help defend the Island of Formosa, which many of us believe is vital to the security of the entire defense perimeter in that area of the world. That is the legislative history of that matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from California has accurately stated the legislative history; and from his point of view, he had that in mind. However, the fact is that we did not provide that the money would be spent by or given to the Republic of China. I happen to be one member of the Foreign Relations Committee who would not have gone along with such a bill. I objected to the China-aid bill, and I offered amendments to the Korean bill.

So it is not correct to say that the Congress has appropriated \$75,000,000 for the Republic of China. That simply is not a fact. The money was appropriated to be spent in that general area.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not yield at the moment. The Senator from California has made his speech, and now I should like to have a little time in which to present my own thoughts. I shall yield to the Senator a little later.

Today, Indochina, in southeast Asia, is in the throes of a civil war brought on by Ho Chi-minh and his adherents against the established authorities there. I think it is very pertinent for us to consider whether the funds should be spent in Indochina; at least, that should be considered. We know that the funds of our Government are not unlimited, and that we must get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar we spend in this field.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the situation today, we should give very serious consideration to what we do with our money. I, for one, do not want to make a snap judgment in regard to a matter which would constitute an overt act and certainly could be considered by the rest of the world as a step by us toward entering into a war with the rest of China.

There is a point which I should like to mention in order to impress upon the Senator from California that there are Members of the Senate who have very different views from his about our ultimate over-all security.

The Senator from California—and quite properly and legitimately, from his point of view—sees our entire future and safety in Asia. I happen to disagree with him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two points without being interrupted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of personal privilege, Mr. President, when my position is unintentionally misrepresented here on the floor, I should like to have an opportunity to state what my position really is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; I yield on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that I have never taken the position that our whole future is wrapped up in Asia. On the contrary, I have supported the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in connection with all proposed legislation calling for aid by us to Europe.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that perhaps I overstated the case. However, I believe that every time the Senator from California has made speeches here in the Senate, many of which are extremely well prepared and good, they nearly always present that point of view.

As I have said, I am not criticizing the Senator from California for that. He is acquainted with that area, and it is perfectly proper for him to present that viewpoint. However, certainly it is accurate to say that the emphasis in the Senator's viewpoint is upon the Far East, as are most of his speeches and discussions. I have read them with much interest, and I must say they are well prepared and excellent. The Senator has just been in that area of the world on a trip, and so forth; and he is well qualified to speak regarding it.

However, I must say that from my point of view our really basic relations in this world are with and toward Europe. Our basic institutions, including the legislative branch of our Government, our religious system, and most of

the ancestry of the people of the United States, derive from Europe, not from the Far East. We have connections there that are very significant in an all-out struggle for survival. In Europe there are organized governments which have institutions similar to ours. When people really are in desperate straits I think they are inclined to cooperate.

The people of Europe understand our system of society much better than do the people of the Far East. I do not say this in criticism of anyone; it is simply a fact of life. In fact, those societies in Europe are capable of being directed either for or against us much more affirmatively in the long run, than is the Far East. The productive power in the case of steel and similar commodities, which I do not wish to review at this time, for we have discussed them many times, is much greater in Europe. Europe can be an offensive power if directed by the Russians, I think, to a much greater extent than in the case of China, especially if we get away from land warfare, where great masses of troops are a major consideration. In other words, if we get into push-button warfare or aerial warfare or other types of warfare which are largely dependent upon the developments of science, Europe will be much more important.

I happen to think that it would be much more dangerous to us if Western Europe and England were to fall under the domination of the Kremlin than if Asia were to fall under Kremlin domination. Of course, it would be better if none of them fell under the domination of the Kremlin; but if we have to make a choice in connection with that matter, as it increasingly seems likely that we may have to, I would say that our emphasis should be placed upon the society and the peoples in Western Europe; I think that should be our objective.

I recognize that there is a fundamental difference between the objective of the Senator from California and my own, and it is one which must be weighed carefully in connection with the consideration of these matters and these legislative proposals. I am not willing, and I do not think our Government is in a position, to make a snap decision in regard to a matter of this much importance, which the Senator from California is seeking to have the Senate act upon now. I think the matter should be studied and carefully considered by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak in behalf of the bill providing authority for the appropriation of funds for Yugoslavia. I am in favor of the passage of this bill because I conceive that it is in the minds and the purposes of all of us that the Soviet Government should not overrun and control the continent of Europe. If there is anyone who lacks interest in that objective, I can readily understand why such a person would vote against this measure authorizing an appropriation for Yugoslavia.

One has only to look at the map of the Mediterranean to realize that the

country of Yugoslavia, with its two-hundred-fifty-odd miles of coast-line as the crow flies, and probably double that amount if the indentations of the coast are included, could be a serious menace if it were under the control of the Soviet Government. It represents an ideal location for nests of submarines. The only location which perhaps would be better in that respect would be Greece; but for the time being—and permanently, we hope—we have saved Greece from conquest by the Soviets. We must help Yugoslavia for the same reason—we have saved Greece—to prevent her conquest by the Soviet Union.

For Russia to have usable submarine bases on the Mediterranean would be an inconceivable situation. True, we are informed that the shorter coast line of Albania, which continues to be under Soviet control, is provided with at least one major submarine base. This is a menace. But so long as Albania is cut off from land connected with the Soviet Republic by Greece and by a hostile Yugoslavia, the usefulness to the Soviet Union of the Albanian submarine base will remain very small indeed. So it is in the support of Yugoslavia's independence from the Soviet Government that we find our tactical and strategic reason for the appropriation called for by the pending bill.

The bill is designed primarily for the relief of populations; but it will help from the military standpoint, because, unless the people of Yugoslavia or of any other European or Asiatic country are reasonably well taken care of according to their own standards, so far as food, clothing, and shelter are concerned, they are bound to fall under the influence of Soviet propaganda. So, from the military standpoint, the first thing we have to think about in connection with Yugoslavia is that her people shall not be subject to subversive influences; and the means of insuring that is to carry her people through the coming winter and into the harvest of next year, when they will again be able to feed themselves and to become prosperous as a result of their own work, done upon their own soil, under their own government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont desires to continue, I shall be glad to yield 5 or 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed for 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I may say that I had about concluded my argument and was planning to finish in a burst of oratory. However, the interruption has interfered with the burst of oratory, and I trust that I may be pardoned if I conclude without it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in my opinion the sum which we are about to

authorize in behalf of Yugoslavia, dollar for dollar, as was said here recently, is about the best investment we shall have been able to make by way of loans or grants to foreign countries, perhaps, aside from aid to Turkey. In the report prepared by the Committee on Foreign Relations, we find the following statement, which I think should go into the RECORD:

Tito espouses nationalist communism rather than imperialist communism which seeks to bind all Communists to the Kremlin. Soviet imperialist communism seeks to rob all states of their independence. Titoism seeks the independence of Communist states from Soviet dictatorship.

Mr. President, I may be wrong about that, and the committee may be in error, but I am absolutely convinced that that is true. In 1948, before Tito broke with the Kremlin, there can be no doubt that Yugoslavia under Tito's domination was at that particular time the principal satellite of the Russian Government. Yugoslavia has now definitely broken with the Kremlin according to all the information which we have in this country. To me, the best evidence of the break with the Kremlin is to be found in the very thing we are doing here. In other words, the Russian Government definitely and categorically refuses to give any economic aid, or to give any relief in the way of food, to people who, as a result of the drought in that country, are on the verge of starvation. If that is not evidence of a break between the two governments, then in my opinion there can be no evidence of such a break. To me, it is conclusive evidence that there is a break, and that it is definite and final; and I sincerely hope that it is.

It seems to me that Tito's government is the one government in central Europe at the present time which stands against Russia and her satellites in their purpose to overrun the Balkans entirely. Perhaps they can overrun them anyway, but at least the Yugoslavs at the present time have 32 divisions, fighting men, if you please, Mr. President, who, I believe, despite what others may think, will fight if and when the time comes. Certainly by giving this small amount of aid to Yugoslavia, which will reflect itself in the army and in the strengthening of Tito's government as a whole, we are doing a very helpful thing.

A moment ago the Senator from Vermont spoke of what had happened in Greece. The truth of the matter is that the guerrillas are out of Greece at the present time, in my judgment, basically because of what Tito has done. In other words, Tito has drawn off his forces around the Greek border, and that is one of the primary reasons for what we find in Greece at the present time. Had Tito continued the course he was pursuing prior to 1948, there would have been a possibility that Greece at the present time would be dominated by the Communists. It is highly important to keep that area from going Communist, because, once Yugoslavia went Communist, Greece would go Communist, and Russia would then control the Mediterranean, a thing which she has sought for a very long time.

I desire to discuss one other point briefly. I hope every Senator will read

the report which has been prepared by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is a very important one. It is constructive and very brief, although it really tells the whole story.

I wish to speak briefly concerning the mathematics of the situation. Merely to equip a single American infantry division costs \$75,000,000. It costs another \$94,000,000, or approximately \$5,000 per man, to maintain such a division at full strength for a year. The grand total is about \$170,000,000, the cost of maintaining one American division in this country for 1 year at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. May I have 3 minutes more?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 3 minutes more to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois may proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Tito, as I said before, commands 32 divisions. If Tito is kept in power, these divisions, I am convinced, will fight in case the Kremlin attacks. The Congress is being asked to appropriate less than one-third of what it would cost to equip and maintain an American division for 1 year, in reality, in order to keep 32 divisions going in Yugoslavia. That is why I said a moment ago that from my own viewpoint the dollars we are spending now are the best dollars we shall have spent in a very long time in Europe, because, as I view the matter, the \$39,000,000 we are appropriating is enough to keep the 32 divisions going, and yet it represents but a third of the amount required to equip and maintain one American division in the United States for a year.

Even in simple terms of dollars and cents, if any Senator is economically minded about it and desires to oppose it upon grounds of economy, it seems to me it would be rather foolish to do so, in view of the example which I have given.

Mr. President, those are the two points which I desired to make briefly with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from California. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment at this particular time. It is inconsistent with section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. The amendment provides as follows:

This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended for assistance to the Republic of China.

Section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act does not, as the Senator from Arkansas said a moment ago, confine itself solely to China, but refers to funds which may be expended in that general area.

The Senator from California wants to expend \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 for the Republic of China. Where is it to be spent? What use is to be made of it? That information would all come out in a hearing, I take it, with respect to the \$38,000,000 which the Senator wants to expend or at least to obligate for the purpose of helping the Republic of China.

I did not hear the Senator's speech, but I doubt if he outlined what he would do with the \$38,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield a minute so that the Senator from California may make his statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that when he was out of the room I pointed out that there have already come from the Republic of China requests which have been screened by the proper authorities, for funds in order to maintain a body of non-Communist troops on the island of Formosa, which is an even larger body of troops than is the group in Yugoslavia.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. But I think Congress should know for what this \$38,000,000 would be spent. Suppose it were to be used to help blockade China. Would the people of the country agree to that? In other words, what does the Senator mean when he says he wishes to have expended \$38,000,000 for the Republic of China at this particular time in the crisis which exists in the Far East? The President now has the power to spend \$75,000,000 in that area, but by the Senator's amendment we would be telling him to spend \$38,000,000 for the Republic of China. If we are going to tell him that, we who are responsible for the amendment ought to indicate to him, before it is appropriated, how he is to spend it and how the Secretary of State would spend it or how the military forces would spend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] intimated that he wanted some time. So far as I am concerned, he may have the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in order to make it perfectly clear that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am heartily supporting the Yugoslav bill, so-called. I also want to make it perfectly clear that the amendment of the Senator from California has my full approval. The \$38,000,000 provided by the amendment comes in the category of the \$75,000,000 which was appropriated for the area of China 2 years ago and continued last year, but was to be spent by the executive department in areas which needed it most.

I have been as much concerned as has been the Senator from California because practically nothing has been contributed to the Republic of China. As I understood, when the Korean crisis arose it was the policy of the Government to support the forces in Formosa against any attack which might come. In fact, we went so far as to say the Seventh Fleet was to be used to protect against an attack. I have been urging on the State Department and on the Department of Defense that such aid be given to the Nationalist forces to help them to defend themselves. I am not talking about a war by the United States in China as re-

ferred to by the Senator from Arkansas, but to the Nationalists there. I think the administration is open to criticism for not having given attention to this phase of the matter and in not using some of the appropriation in that area. But I pass that for the moment, because we shall soon be discussing it when the Senator from California makes his motion to recommit the bill.

I listened to all the testimony with respect to the bill. I had as many doubts as had any other members of the committee. Every member of the committee had doubts whether the reason for the hunger in Yugoslavia today is that the Yugoslav farmers themselves have been dragging their feet when it comes to producing because of Tito's regulations with regard to farming, and so forth. It was suggested in many quarters that it was due to their own fault and to the regulations of the government that food was short. But I was convinced that that argument had been overstated when a representative of our own Agriculture Department, Mr. John J. Haggerty, who has been in that country 2 or 3 years and has made a complete study of the whole situation, pointed out that the famine this year was unprecedented in the history of that area, and that unless aid came very quickly there would be widespread famine and distress. If that should come about, then we would be faced with the danger that if we declined to render aid, aid would come from the other side of the iron curtain, and Yugoslavia would become a satellite of Russia.

So we had all the humanitarian inducements to save people from distress, and we had all the inducements that it was necessary and desirable at this time to keep Yugoslavia on this side of the curtain and a member of the western nations who are resisting Communist domination from Moscow. Of course, we know that Yugoslavia is a Communist state, but it is no longer, in my judgment, connected with or dominated by Moscow. It is opposed to Moscow and is trying to prevent being taken over by Moscow. When we considered the eastern end of the Mediterranean in its relation to Turkey and Italy, looking at the matter from a purely military standpoint, I was convinced from the testimony of our military advisers that the thing to do was to give this aid to keep 30 divisions in Yugoslavia in line with the western group of nations if there should be any invasion of Europe.

Mr. President, I support this bill and I hope it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to take up the time of the Senate, except to make one expression, and that is that the amendment which I have offered will take nothing from the effectiveness of this bill. It will permit the utilization of not to exceed \$50,000,999 from ECA funds for Yugoslav relief. Already \$12,000,000 has been morally committed for the relief of Yugoslavia, and \$38,000,000 more is requested by the bill. The amendment, if it is adopted, will eliminate the idea of having to make another appropriation. It will simply

use not to exceed \$38,000,000 more than has been already used from ECA funds for relief purposes in Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said a little while ago, that I have no faith in Mr. Tito. I do not believe he means to be friendly to this country. I do not believe he is at heart other than the reddest of red Communists. I do not believe he has any sympathy with our form of government. But the people of Yugoslavia may be starving and may be dying, and it may be that by this shot in the dark we may be able to strengthen ourselves in central Europe.

So far as I am concerned, without any faith in Mr. Tito whatever, because I think he is a brigand and a murderer of the first order—he has murdered his way into the position which he now occupies, and he is destroying every phase of godliness that there is in his country—at the same time, if it will save American lives when the struggle comes, which I believe is coming, between this country and Russia, I am willing to go along with the bill. But I do not think we should make another appropriation and thus lay another burden on the taxpayers of America when we have more than enough money to carry out all the plans of ECA, and, at the same time, to take care of this item out of ECA funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MAHON], for himself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I cannot proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I should like to state that the committee accepts the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the so-called McMahon-Connally amendment, with respect to religious persecution, is the pending amendment. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Lehman
Anderson	George	Long
Brewster	Gillette	Lucas
Bricker	Gurney	McCarran
Bridges	Hayden	McCarthy
Butler	Hendrickson	McClellan
Byrd	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Capehart	Holland	McMahon
Carlson	Hunt	Magnuson
Chavez	Ives	Malone
Clements	Jenner	Martin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Donnell	Kefauver	Mundt
Douglas	Kerr	Murray
Dworshak	Kilgore	Neely
Eaton	Knowland	Nixon
Ellender	Langer	O'Connor
Flanders	Leahy	Pepper
Frear		Robertson

Russell	Taft	Watkins
Saltonstall	Taylor	Wherry
Schoeppel	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Smith, N. J.	Thye	Young
Smith, N. C.	Tobey	
Stennis	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] for himself and on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as endorsing measures undertaken by the present Government of Yugoslavia which suppress or destroy religious, political, and economic liberty, and the Yugoslav Government shall be so notified when aid is furnished under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that all time for debate on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which the clerk has read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, through 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The President is hereby authorized to expend not in excess of \$50,000,000 of the funds heretofore appropriated for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Administration Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.), for the purpose of providing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia under the authority of this act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, debate on the amendment is limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I am concerned, I have no further remarks to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no other Senator wishes to be recognized, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not yet offered the amendment. I should like to have an opportunity to explain it. I am entitled to be recognized for 10 minutes. I thought some other amendments would be accepted by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and we could get such amendments out of the way first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of any equipment, materials, or commodities made available under the provisions of this act and transported on ocean vessels (computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liners and tankers) shall be transported on United States flag commercial vessels at market rates for United States flag commercial vessels, if available.

On page 3, line 17, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "7."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, 20 minutes of debate is allowed on the amendment. The time for debate is to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes. The purpose of my amendment is to again place into the economic aid acts the restriction that at least 50 percent of the goods which America sends to foreign countries shall be transported in American-flag ships if they are available. This is the only way in which we can keep our merchant marine alive. The amendment would bring the pending bill into conformity and uniformity with all other foreign-aid acts. I am sure there will be no objection to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Why not make it 100 percent? If we are to fly our flag over there, why not let the people over there see it as often as possible, since we are to spend our dollars over there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make it 100 percent, but as a practical matter it is not advisable, because in many cases the availability of American-flag ships is such that they could not transport 100 percent of the goods. In this particular case there may have to be some deviation, as provided in the bill, if the ships are available. Like the Senator from Arkansas, I believe that the day is coming soon when we can ship in American-flag ships a great deal more of the goods we are providing for Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. McMAHON. I am informed that the chairman of the committee has agreed to take this amendment to conference.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. At the termination of each 3-month period after aid has been extended under this act the Secretary of State shall make a full and detailed report to the Congress. Said 3-month reports shall not be limited to, but shall include (1) information as to whether or not Yugoslavia is abiding by the agreement as provided for under section 3 of this act; (2) information as to any developments in the attitude of Yugoslavia with respect to basic human rights.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, and the committee, we are willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 7. This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended or obligated for expenditure for assistance to the Republic of China.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not yet offered the amendment. I wish to explain it in the 10 minutes available to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. How can the Senator have it read and speak on it without offering it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not yielded for the purpose of the Senator making a point of order. I shall offer the amendment, but I desire the floor so that I may explain it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will get the floor when his time comes. I insist on my right to make a point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not yielded for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had recognized the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make the point of order—

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not yielded for that purpose, I respectfully say.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yielded to the Senator and let him speak for 10 or 15 minutes, but now he has not the courtesy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; because I do not want my amendment ruled out by the chairman before I have an opportunity to explain the background for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is running.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since it is obvious that a point of order is to be made, I think the Senate should understand the background of this situation. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8 it will be found that there was a quorum call, as is usual when a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, in connection with the railroad labor bill. That information is found on page 16336. Fifteen pages later in the RECORD, without a quorum call, the original unanimous-consent agreement was amended to include the bill for Yugoslavia. The agreement also contained a provision that amendments which were not germane should not be included. My general understanding of the purpose of such a provision is to prevent, for example, an FEPC amendment, or some civil-rights amendment being offered. I believe that my amendment is quite germane, although technically it may not be, under this provision.

It is therefore foreclosed, even though I was present at the time of the original unanimous-consent agreement, but then I left the Senate Chamber to participate in hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I was engaged in Senate business. I had no idea that a unanimous-consent agreement was to be entered into in connection with the Yugoslavian situation. Had I been present, I would at least have insisted that I be allowed to offer this amendment. So I am foreclosed from offering the amendment if, presumably, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. President, I am prepared to support some aid for Yugoslavia, even though I recognize that it has a Communist government, although it is temporarily not aligned with the Kremlin. On two different occasions, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and again in the second session, the Congress provided \$75,000,000 for the general area of China, with the clear intent that at least a substantial part should go to the Republic of China. First, there was authorization legislation, which was later confirmed by appropriation legislation. Then the money was put into a deep freeze and buried, so that little if any of the money was used. So the only point at issue is that it seems to me that, since communism is global in character, we have a right to say that our Pacific flank is no less important than our Adriatic flank.

The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] stated that Mr. Tito had approximately 32 divisions. If those divisions are on the Russian model of 10,000 men each, that means 320,000 men in the Communist army of Mr. Tito, who is temporarily not aligned with the Kremlin. If those divisions are approximately as large as ours, consisting of 15,000 men, it means a total of 470,000 men. But I call attention to the fact that on the island of Formosa there are more than 600,000 non-Communists; and if it is important from a manpower situation to give aid to Communist Tito, it is equally important to give aid to the non-Communist Republic of China, which has been our ally in two world wars, is a per-

manent member of the United Nations, and is a permanent member of the Security Council.

I point out that the Republic of China has never shot down any American planes and Mr. Tito's Yugoslavia has. The Republic of China has consistently supported in the United Nations the efforts of the free world against aggression in Korea. China has voted with the free nations of the world 100 percent of the time I submit that the record of Yugoslavia is that she has very seldom voted with the free nations of the world.

I have been on the island of Formosa twice. In Formosa there is freedom of the press. There is freedom of religion for every church of every type and character. I submit that that situation does not exist in Yugoslavia.

I have no objection, in order to drive a wedge into the ranks of the satellites, to giving some aid to Yugoslavia, and will support it. But I also say that it is equally important, since communism is global in character, to take advantage of some 600,000 non-Communist troops who are subject to aggressive action by communism, across the straits between the Republic of China on Formosa, and Red China on the mainland.

That is the basic issue. This amendment does not provide a single extra dollar. The money has already been appropriated by the Congress. It does not provide a new authorization. The authorization was made in two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress, by the Congress of the United States.

When it was obviously shown that the legislative history was that the Republic of China was meant, some flexible language was inserted so that in case the Republic of China should be overwhelmed, the funds could be used in southeast Asia or elsewhere. But it was never intended, so far as the Republic of China was concerned, that the funds should be put in a deep freeze, and that the Republic of China should get very little, if anything, from the two appropriations of \$75,000,000.

Mr. President, I am forced into this situation because of the background which I have pointed out. There was no quorum call prior to the unanimous consent agreement. If the point of order is made and sustained, I do not intend to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I do intend to offer a motion to recommit, reading as follows:

I move that the bill (S. 42C1) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate forthwith, including therein all amendments agreed to by the Senate to date, together with the following amendment:

Then follows my amendment adding a new section at the end of the bill.

I am forced into this situation, because I am foreclosed from offering and securing a vote on the amendment itself. All it will do will be at least to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the question as to whether non-Communists in the Republic of China are at

least worthy of as much consideration as the Communists of Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, am I in order to make a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Yes; the Senator is in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I make a point of order on the amendment of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California propose his motion now?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I move my amendment, which is now subject to a point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I make the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from California is not germane as an amendment to the original bill. It is set forth clearly in the unanimous consent agreement that amendments have to be germane. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me obvious that the amendment offered by the Senator from California is germane. Exactly the same question is involved in it as is involved in the bill. Many Senators may hesitate to vote for aid to a man who has killed American boys, who murdered Mikhailovich, unless the Senate is prepared to adopt, as a part of a general policy, that Nationalist China shall be treated in a similar way. Just as Yugoslavia is considered at least to be a diversionary force against Russia, so non-Communist China may be considered as a diversionary force against Communist China.

Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment is perfectly germane. It is clearly involved in the general subject of the bill. It is a part of the one general policy. I submit that the Chair should rule the amendment to be in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to clear my mind on one point in regard to the question of germaneness. Did I understand the Senator from California to designate in his amendment the Republic of China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Was there a Republic of China designated in the original legislation authorization, or was it some vaguer term like "in the general vicinity"?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the original bill, in order to obtain a compromise and receive the support of those who would vote for aid to the Republic of China as well as those who would not, the general language was adopted "in the general area of China," but it was felt, I am sure, that no one would claim on the floor that the Republic of China was not one of the nations in the general area of China.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to me, Mr. President, that in coming to a determination as to whether the amendment is out of order, consideration should be given to whether it introduces a new piece of legislation in that it re-

stricts application of the fund to the Republic of China instead of to the general area.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The section which is involved, section 303 of title III of Public Law 329, Eighty-first Congress, reads as follows:

In consideration of the concern of the United States in the present situation in China, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$75,000,000 in addition to funds otherwise appropriated as an emergency fund for the President, which may be expended to accomplish in that general area the policies and purposes declared in this act.

The amendment of the Senator from California now would direct the President to spend \$38,000,000 in the Republic of China, which clearly conflicts with the original language.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say I am in sympathy with the Senator from California in feeling that there has been a complete evasion of the intent of Congress in making the \$75,000,000 appropriation. I nevertheless feel strongly that anything which delays or cripples the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against a new nest of Russian submarine bases has got to be considered on its own merits. It is for that reason I hope that, so far as the substance is concerned, real justification will be found for ruling this particular amendment out of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Vermont familiar with the fact that while there may be potential submarine bases in Yugoslavia, there are also potential submarine bases and air bases in Formosa; that it was from Formosa that the Japanese war lords attacked the Philippines, and that we have a very deep obligation to the Philippines and to Australia? So if we are going to close the door to communism in the Adriatic, we should take some realistic and practical steps to close it in the Pacific Ocean as well.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from California—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Permit the Chair to make an observation. It seems to the Chair that the point of order comes under the 20-minute rule. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that the time be divided equally between the mover of the amendment and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CONNALLY). If there is going to be extended debate the Chair thinks the time limitation ought to be observed. Does the Senator from Texas wish the floor?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the unanimous-consent agreement cover debate on a point of order when the Chair is about ready to rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is discretionary with the Chair whether he wants to hear debate or not. He is glad to hear the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to argue the point of order. It seems to me that under the unanimous-consent agreement it is perfectly obvious the amendment has no relation whatever to the bill, which deals exclusively with Yugoslavia. Now to endeavor to bring in Chiang Kai-shek is not germane at all. Besides, as pointed out a minute ago, the amendment does not even comprehend the original law, because instead of saying, "in the general area of China," which the authorization provided, it restricts itself to "assistance to the Republic of China." So the amendment narrows the original scope.

Mr. President, I do not care to argue the point of order. I simply think the amendment is not germane under the language of the act, and I submit the question to the Chair for decision.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have the time.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not understand there was any time limitation. As I understood, the Chair said discussion could be had in the discretion and indulgence of the Chair at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may do so, I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I regret I did not hear all of the learned address delivered by the Senator from California. I have read the able Senator's amendment, however. I do not know how he happened to have chosen the figure \$38,000,000. What I wanted to ask the Senator is, Does he know what commitments have already been made with respect to the \$75,000,000 provided for in the original act, which was to be spent in the general area of China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will answer the Senator from Florida in this way. The \$38,000,000 is to place the far eastern flanks on a parity with the situation dealt with in the particular bill before us. That is number one.

No. 2. It is within, and well within, the over-all figures of \$75,000,000, which the Congress has twice approved as a matter of policy, and twice approved as a matter of appropriation.

The third point is that with the exception of a very infinitesimal amount, there has been little, if anything, given to the Republic of China out of the two \$75,000,000 amounts. The last figures I saw showed that a considerable amount, in the neighborhood of from thirty to thirty-five million dollars, was left out of the last appropriation of some \$75,000,000. I do not have the most up-to-date figures, but that is, I believe, substantially correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason I make the point is that on the one question whether we would appropriate \$38,000,000 or not I might feel entirely different. But if we direct that \$38,000,000 be taken out of a particular appropriation we might be running the risk of taking away funds that had perhaps already been committed. For example, I remember distinct-

ly that some of that money is going to Siam, to provide for its defense, and Siam, has troops fighting with us in Korea. There might be other cases in which commitments of this money have been made, and the \$38,000,000 might not be available. If the Senator wants to have Congress appropriate \$38,000,000 of new money, so there would not be any possibility of conflict, that would be something else. Has the Senator assurance that \$38,000,000 of the particular fund he describes remains available and is not committed? That is something that should be considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, there have been two appropriations of \$75,000,000. Certainly in both of them it was not expected by the Congress that the Republic of China would be put into a deep freeze and not obtain any substantial help out of either of those \$75,000,000 appropriations.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I raise a point of order. I judge that debate on the amendment has been concluded by reason of the time factor, and that we ought to be debating the point of order. Should not the subsequent discussion be directed strictly to the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Chair does not mean to state, does he, that the point of order on the question of germaneness, which is being raised, is subject to the limitations of the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is discretionary as to whether debate shall be heard. The Chair has been very glad, indeed, to hear the debate, so far as it has covered the subject matter.

Unless some Senator has a point to make as to the germaneness of the amendment, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for that observation, because it is in keeping with the decisions of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the only question in the mind of the Chair.

Unless some Senator has something to say that is particularly pertinent to the immediate question before the Chair, the Chair is prepared to rule.

By referring first to the provision contained in the unanimous-consent agreement:

That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received—

We find that any motion or amendment must be germane to the subject matter of the bill.

What is the subject matter of the bill? It is "to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia."

In other words, there is a very broad opening there, but a very fine bead is drawn by the word "by." The words "furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia" seem to limit the entire scope of the bill. Strictly under those terms, the Chair thinks the point of order is well taken; and the Chair so rules.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to observe that sometimes we move along very rapidly. I have prepared a motion to recommit, and I understand that the motion is in order following the third reading of the bill, just before the final passage of the bill. I wish to be protected in my right to offer that motion, and therefore I give notice that I intend to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion will be in order at any time before the final passage of the bill.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senator from California makes his motion to recommit, he then will have 10 minutes to speak on his motion, will he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to note that the Senate adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon]. That amendment, as I understand from reading it, requires, among other things, that there shall be a periodic report upon the attitude of Yugoslavia with respect to the observance of basic human rights by the Government of Yugoslavia. It is the observation of basic human rights which lies at the very heart of the present critical dilemma with which the world is faced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair observe that the Senate is operating under a special limitation of debate, with 20 minutes allowed for debate on any motion or amendment. No amendment is pending, so far as the Chair understands, and no motion is pending.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to take very much time. If necessary, I offer a technical amendment to strike out paragraph 3 (a) on page 2 of the bill, an amendment which I shall later withdraw.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; the Senator from Wyoming may debate his amendment for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to say that I have observed that section 3 of the bill provides that:

No assistance under authority of this act shall be made available nor shall any funds appropriated hereunder be expended until an agreement is entered into between Yugoslavia and the United States—

Containing certain undertakings.

I wish to make the record clear that, for my part, I believe that the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut are just as binding as are the provisions of section 3 with respect to the agreement. As a member of the

Appropriations Committee, I shall be free at all times to pass upon not only the agreement contained in section 3 and the reports which may be made upon the manner in which that agreement is to be carried out, but also the reports which are to be made with respect to the observance of basic human rights. I wish it to be clearly understood that I undertake no obligation, legal or moral, with respect to my judgment as a member of the Appropriations Committee to vote for or against any of the appropriations which are authorized in this measure.

I now withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wyoming is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit the motion, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I move that the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia, be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions to report the said bill back to the Senate forthwith, including all amendments agreed to by the Senate to date, together with the following amendment; viz, at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"Sec. 7. This act shall not become effective until at least \$38,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of carrying out section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, has been expended or obligated for expenditure for assistance to the Republic of China."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, I have 10 minutes in which to speak on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Members of the Senate that, had it not been for the second unanimous-consent agreement, which was made some time after the first one, and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 15 pages after the first one, for which there was properly a quorum call, although there was not a quorum call immediately prior to the second unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment would be germane to the bill. It is foreclosed by the second unanimous-consent agreement, immediately prior to which a quorum call was not had.

I wish to point out that if the Senate, consisting of 96 Members, representing the 48 States of the Union, surrenders the power to legislate into the hands of any committee of 13 members, regardless of how distinguished its members may be, we shall have completely surrendered into the hands of the committee the legislative power of the Senate of the United States.

If we are to discharge our responsibilities properly, I take it that we are not required to rubber-stamp the action of the Foreign Relations Committee or of the Armed Services Committee or of the Appropriations Committee; and I say that most respectfully, as a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. Certainly I would never consider urging upon the Senate the passage of a bill, as reported by any of its committees, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," because the legislative power and the constitutional responsibility for foreign policy as well as for domestic policy rest in the hands of the Congress of the United States, of which the Senate is a coordinate branch.

I quite frankly admit that there is room for an honest difference of opinion as to whether we believe that in dealing with communism, an international world-wide menace, the door to Asia should be closed as tightly as the door to Europe is closed. However, I submit that is a very pertinent question in connection with the matter of foreign relations.

I speak as one who has supported the bipartisan foreign policy. However, it does not make sense for us to close the door of Europe against communism, but leave the door of Asia wide open to communism, when there are many persons who sincerely believe that if we permit the billion and one-half persons in Asia and all the vast stores of tin, rubber, petroleum, and other important products to be found in that part of the world to fall into the hands of the Soviet Union, it will be most difficult to stop aggressive communism in Europe alone. That is a basic issue which we are facing today, and I am forced to this parliamentary procedure because I was foreclosed by the unanimous-consent agreement to which I have already referred.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], I wish to point out that this would involve no delay, because the motion to recommit provides that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report back forthwith. There cannot be a delay of more than 24 hours at most, and it would be a very wise delay, for it would enable us then to provide some aid where it would help protect the American boys who are now fighting in Korea, at the same time that we are providing aid to save the starving people of Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the motion is made to recommit the bill to the committee for the purpose of having the committee report some provision to give money to the Republic of China. We all admire the zeal with which the Senator from California rushes forth, sword in hand, whenever anyone mentions the Chinese Nationalists or Chiang Kai-shek. It is really a fine, loyal position for him to take. But, Mr. President, why should we restrict it to the Republic of China? I invite the attention of the Senator

from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Why should we not give some of this money to Indochina? Why should we not bring in Burma and appropriate a large amount of money for Burma? Why not aid Pakistan? Why not aid other Asiatic countries? Why should we restrict it to the Republic of China?

The Senator says, "We have not done anything for China, and we are not doing anything for her." Did we not do something for China when she was supposed to be fighting the northern Chinese and the Communists? Did not the United States, from its coffers, hand over to Chiang Kai-shek \$2,000,000,000 in supplies and munitions? General Barr, an American, was in the Far East as an observer. He testified before our committee that Chiang Kai-shek's troops had never lost a battle as the result of lacking arms, supplies, or materials—which we were furnishing. The only battles they lost were those in which they did not want to fight, and in which they did not fight. The situation is quite different today. Do Senators want an all-out war with Red China?

Mr. President, why should the Senate recommit this bill? It is an important measure which has been carefully considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee held hearings. Witnesses appeared before the committee. The situation is important, and the demand is insistent. Everyone knows the attitude of communism in Europe. The pending bill is a vital one, designed to put a stop to Communist pressure on Yugoslavia and other Balkan states, upon Greece, and upon the Mediterranean area generally. I trust that the Senate will not vote to recommit the bill.

Why did not the Senator from California come before the committee when the bill was pending there to propose his amendment? He did not come. He was not even present when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into in the Senate. The Senator says, "Mr. President, we are not going to permit one committee—we are not going to permit any committee—to take over the legislative duties of the United States Senate." The statement is gratuitous. We are not proposing to take over the duties of the Senate. Merely because the Senator does not happen to be present in the Senate when a unanimous-consent agreement is made is that a denial of the power, the authority, and the sovereignty of the Senate itself? The Senate is governed by rules. If we do not follow the rules, they can be invoked through points of order followed by appropriate action. One may not remain at home, or in a committee room, and expect to run the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will permit me to make this observation in his time, I desire to say that it seems to me the important thing about the bill is that it is an emergency measure. It has been reported as such. The Committee on Foreign Relations, at the request of the President and of the Secre-

tary of State, were diligent in bringing this measure before the Senate, in order that we might make some disposition of it before this short session closes.

Mr. President, as surely as I stand here, if this bill is recommitted, the Yugoslavs will receive no aid during this brief session of the Congress, because the committee will take time to discuss this \$38,000,000 item, as to where it shall go and as to how it shall go, and as to how it shall be expended. Witnesses will have to appear. I undertake to say that we are jeopardizing our own interests through not speeding this measure on its way and appropriating the money it provides for Yugoslavia, if the drought and the resulting shortage of food are as reported to the Senate and to the people of the country.

The bill should be passed speedily in the interest of the safety and security of the country. With all due deference to my friend from California, and even though he may be justified later in seeking to have what he proposes done through a separate bill, I say it should not be tied into the pending bill, perhaps resulting in defeat of a measure which is so urgently needed at this particular time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that, if this proposal came before the Senate by the introduction of a separate bill, it would be another matter. The Senator from California could have such a bill considered by the appropriate committee, and it would be given proper consideration by the Senate. I submit that to tie down the present bill with an amendment of this sort would be destructive of the purposes of the bill. Furthermore, it would not, in the long run, accomplish what the Senator from California has in mind. If it is proposed to penalize the Yugoslavs in order to make a gesture toward the Chinese Nationalists, the result would be that neither of them would be served properly.

This is a vital measure. The emergency is upon us. We ought to act upon the bill as reported, and we ought to act promptly in order to get this relief to Yugoslavia. If we hesitate, if we play tricks here in considering this matter, the effect of it will be that the Yugoslavs will lose some of their ardor. They will begin to doubt our sincerity. They will begin to doubt our anxiety to give them aid. So, Mr. President, I oppose the motion to recommit, and I urge the Senate to vote it down, so that we may proceed to a vote upon the pending bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall merely take 2 minutes, after which I want to yield some time, because certain questions have been raised. I want to be stopped at the expiration of the 2 minutes.

The question is: Why did not the Senator from California offer this amendment earlier?

I shall give a very real reason: It is because I had hoped that in the communiqué which was issued by the Presi-

dent of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain they would show that a firm stand would be taken in the Far East. But I did not expect the British Government to offer its hand of welcome into the United Nations to the bloody Chinese Communists who are killing United Nations forces in Korea today. I did not expect that to happen. That is why I was not before the committee earlier.

I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that from VJ-day until last year the Chinese Communists had suffered a million and a quarter casualties at the hands of the Chinese Nationalists. It is true that the Chinese Nationalist forces were being pushed back; but so are United Nations forces in Korea today.

I called attention also to the fact that in the white paper itself, in the statement by the President of the United States in January 1946, he said that of the surplus material there was none that had not been demilitarized.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes, first to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the remainder of my time to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I regret that this has become a matter of controversy. I think we all recognize the seriousness of the situation. I desire to make clear that it is not at all evident exactly what we are getting for the \$38,000,000 or the \$75,000,000 we are making available to Yugoslavia. In that connection I want to read briefly from a letter published in the New York Times of today under the heading "Appraising Tito's Army" and to have the entire letter inserted in the RECORD. I read:

In his dispatches, your Belgrade correspondent has repeatedly stated that "the Yugoslav Army is the strongest army in Europe except the Soviet Army." It seems that the same opinion has been shared by some other American observers in Europe also; so it is stated by one of them that Tito's army has "30 or 32 divisions of hard-beaten fighters."

Moreover, some official American documents recently published show that the above opinions have been accepted by the American authorities as statements of fact.

May I warn against precipitate and hasty acceptance of such opinions?

The superficiality of western and especially American opinions regarding the real strength of the Yugoslav Army in the wars sounds a warning against hasty opinions. In the years when the Nazi menace was growing on the European continent, western observers considered and publicly praised the Royal Yugoslav Army of those days as "the strongest army in Europe." Even the shrewd observer John Gunther wrote in *Inside Europe* in 1936 that the Royal Yugoslav Army was "probably the most formidable army in Europe."

When, however, this army was put to the test, it proved worthless and was unable to offer any serious resistance. The enormous discrepancy between the opinion of western observers and the realities was due principally to the uncritical acceptance of the information supplied by an authoritarian regime as well as to the inadequate regard for the feelings and opinion of the masses which form the vital component of a modern

army but have no possibility of expressing freely their sentiments in peacetime.

I wonder whether they are aware that Tito's army officers, owing to their overbearing and haughty behavior and to their privileged position, are the most hated and despised group of the present ruling class of Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of this letter be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, and I hope we shall have some assurance that some of these persons will fight with us and work with us if we go forward in this program.

There being no objection, the remainder of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I quote in addition three points which call for cautiousness in conclusions:

How little western observers on the spot know of Tito's army is illustrated by the fact that they were able to get Tito's military publications only recently.

I wonder whether they are aware that Tito's army officers, owing to their overbearing and haughty behavior and to their privileged position, are the most hated and despised group of the present ruling class of Yugoslavia.

The problems arising from the formation of only one up-to-date division should indicate the value of statements regarding Tito's "30 or 32 divisions of hard-beaten fighters."

JURAJ KRNEJIC,
Former Vice Premier of Yugoslavia,
Secretary General, Croatian Peasant Party.

LONDON, December 4, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from California would consider amending his motion so that it would provide only that the bill be recommitted with instructions to report forthwith, and omit the specific portion of the amendment, for this reason, that I hope if the Senator modifies his amendment the Senate will approve it. Certainly the Senator from California has a right to his day in court, without setting out the specific amendment, but letting the committee report the bill to the Senate forthwith, at which time the Senator from California can offer any amendment he chooses to offer.

I make that plea because, when the agreement was entered into, I was not on the floor. I later suggested that there might be other Senators who desired to offer amendments, which is the general rule, so that there would be 20 minutes upon the amendment, 10 minutes on each side.

The Senator from California offered an amendment. It does not make any difference whether it was submitted to the committee or whether it was not, because he had a right to offer it, and he feels strongly about it.

Mr. President, this is a moral obligation. It is in the interest of fair play that the Senator be given an opportunity to offer his amendment on the floor of the Senate. If he should do what I have suggested, it would not mean that we would be voting on the amendment at all; we would simply be recommitting the bill so as to clarify the procedure, and the committee could report the bill. If we do not want the amendment, we can vote it down, or some other amend-

ment can be adopted. That is the fair way to do it.

I hope every Senator will give the Senator from California a chance to have his day in court. It can be done in that way without hurting anyone's feelings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I modify my motion to that extent, cutting out all the language beyond the word "forthwith."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his motion to the extent of eliminating certain language. The clerk will read the language of the motion as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to modify the motion to read as follows:

I move that Senate bill 4234 to promote the foreign policy and to provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report the said bill back to the Senate forthwith.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the bill is recommitted and then reported to the Senate, does that mean that the debate starts anew and can continue for an indefinite period?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be a new day in court when it comes back.

Mr. AIKEN. And the debate can continue indefinitely?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California, as modified.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut

[Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—38

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Nixon
Butler	Jenner	O'Connor
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Schoeppel
Carlson	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Morse	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Holland	Magnuson
Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Long	Stennis
George	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McFarland	Tobey
Hayden	McKellar	Tydings
Hill	McMahon	Wiley

NOT VOTING—16

Benton	Hoey	Sparkman
Bridges	Humphrey	Taylor
Chapman	Kefauver	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lodge	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	
Green	Myers	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. I vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result has been announced. The vote of the Senator from New Hampshire cannot be cast at this time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was with some regret that I placed myself on the side opposite to that taken by the Senator from California. I did so because of my feeling that the undertaking in Yugoslavia ought to have a free road. I also feel that the discussion and determination of our policy with reference to the Chinese Republic should likewise have a free road, and that we should have early discussion and an early decision of that question. I merely wish to place myself on record as feeling that necessity exists for arriving at such a decision, and to

express the hope that we can get to a consideration of the subject in the opening days of the new Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The total proposed program of emergency relief assistance for Yugoslavia consists entirely of commodities procured or to be procured through the Department of Agriculture and shipped directly to Yugoslavia. The program totals 603,900 tons, including 464,500 tons of grains, 70,000 tons of vegetables and rice, 20,000 tons of lard, 20,000 tons of sugar, 4,500 tons of dried eggs, 6,000 tons of dried milk, 900 tons of canned meat, and 18,000 tons of seeds. The total costs of supplying these foods including transportation is \$69,400,000.

Under the stopgap program already in progress, 248,900 tons of food and feed are being provided under the Economic Cooperation Administration Act, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act and under a line of credit extended to the Yugoslav Government by the Export-Import Bank. As a part of the stopgap program 140,000 tons of wheat are being shipped by the ECA from the United States to Italy and Germany, which countries are in turn supplying about 110,000 tons of milled flour to Yugoslavia. The processing of this wheat into flour has afforded the milling industries of Italy and Germany an opportunity to utilize their facilities more fully and in this way a definite contribution has been made to the economic health of these countries. The \$5,600,000 in funds provided by the Export-Import Bank were used for the purchase and shipment of surplus beans, eggs, and meat from the Department of Agriculture, also for lard purchased in the open market by the Department of Agriculture for Yugoslav account.

The remaining portion of the program now before the Congress consists of 355,000 tons of food, feed, and seeds as follows: 276,000 tons of grains, 50,000 tons of vegetables and rice, 5,000 tons of lard, 6,000 tons of dried milk, and 18,000 tons of seeds. The cost of the commodities and their shipment under this part of the program is estimated at \$34,400,000. All of these commodities will be procured by the Department of Agriculture with appropriated funds. No funds will be turned over to the Yugoslav Government.

Of the total program before the Congress, 71 percent will be procured from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation while the balance or 29 percent, chiefly flour, lard, and seeds, must be purchased in the open market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SALTONSTALL and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is absent on official business. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia, and on this vote he is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Anderson	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Bridges	George	Kefauver
Butler	Gillette	Kerr
Cain	Gurney	Kilgore
Carlson	Hayden	Knowland
Clements	Hendrickson	Leahy
Connally	Hill	Lehman
Donnell	Holland	Long
Douglas	Hunt	Lucas
Ellender	Ives	McCarthy

McFarland	Nixon	Smith, N. C.
McKellar	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McMahon	Pepper	Taft
Magnuson	Robertson	Thomas, Utah
Martin	Russell	Thye
Millikin	Saltonstall	Tobey
Morse	Schoeppel	Tydings
Murray	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Neely	Smith, N. J.	Wiley

NAYS—21

Bricker	Frear	McClellan
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Malone
Capehart	Jenner	Mundt
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Cordon	Kem	Wherry
Dworshak	Langer	Williams
Ecton	McCarran	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Benton	Green	Myers
Brewster	Hoe	Sparkman
Chapman	Humphrey	Taylor
Eastland	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg

So the bill (S. 4234) was passed.

Mr. O'CONOR subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of my vote on the Yugoslav bill be printed in the RECORD immediately following the vote on its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

In the light of established facts as to Tito's antagonism to the United States and to the democratic freedoms for which this Nation always has stood, our people have a right to ask—as they are asking—"When are we going to stop giving aid to our enemies; when are we going to cease strengthening those whose announced purpose is to destroy us?"

In my opinion a Communist is a Communist, whether he practices his nefarious creed in Russia, north China, or in Yugoslavia. Their ultimate objective is to destroy our way of life, which is the only barrier to their quest for world supremacy.

I am not unmindful of the new doctrine which the State Department is espousing at the moment, that Tito is going to help save us from Russia, if we, in turn, will keep him from being driven out of his Communist dictatorship. But, like so many of my fellow citizens, I am becoming somewhat disillusioned about the chances of winning avowed Communists to our side. The glaring evidence of Communist solidarity against western aims for peace is vividly before us in Korea. We were going to wean the Chinese Communists away from their motherland, Russia, by kindness, but, instead, the United States helped to make possible their recent conquest of the mainland and their aggression in Korea, and has paved the way to a possible show-down struggle between the east and west by supplying them with many of the vital supplies they needed to prepare them for war against us.

Are we going to make the same blunder again, by strengthening Tito just when nature and the accumulated results of his diabolic rule were threatening to bring about his downfall?

Has Tito proven his friendship for the United States? In the light of Moscow's oft-demonstrated policy of double-dealing and hypocrisy, of lying and deceit, can anyone be reasonably sure that Tito's protestation of enmity toward the Soviet is genuine, and not simply another of the devious deceptions for which Moscow is so well known?

Yugoslavia, under Tito, has violated, time and time again, every principle of justice and humanity in its dealings with minority groups within its own borders. To question any of the unjust practices of Tito's totalitarian regime has been to invite death or

banishment; even to question the morality of the most vicious acts of violence against members of racial or religious groups has been an open invitation to disaster. Many of Yugoslavia's leading patriots and finest citizens have faced the firing squad, or are undergoing the living death of forced labor, because they could not approve the injustices upon which their dictator depends to rule.

Tito has vented his rancor against America on many occasions. His underlings rarely have missed an opportunity to express their scorn of all things American in their treatment of United States nationals, and in their replies to official United States protest. Their shooting down American flyers, 2 years after the war's end, in two separate attacks, killing five of our aviators, at the very time when American help was being given generously to aid Yugoslavia's hungry people, was an instance of their supreme contempt for their benefactors.

What of the vicious facts of Tito's dictatorship and of the thousands of members of Yugoslav religious groups, Orthodox, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, whose persecution and sufferings have shocked the world since Tito's accession to power? Civilization was aghast at the farcical trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, a patriot who had won highest military honors in the army of his native land, and whose heroic resistance first to Nazi intolerance and later to Tito's ruthlessness knew no boundaries of color, or race, or creed. But Archbishop Stepinac was only one of 1,500 Yugoslav priests who were killed, imprisoned, or exiled—only one of 400,000 members of his faith in Croatia alone who have given their lives because they would not bow to Tito's will.

That our memories may be refreshed as to the type of government and type of dictator-ruler to whom we are now being asked to supply additional aid, I will take but a moment to quote very briefly excerpts from statements and editorials, the truth of which has not been controverted by any later developments in Tito's regime.

Winston Churchill advised the British House of Commons on November 1, 1946, and I quote: "Conditions in Yugoslavia are sinister and melancholic. The whole country is being as far as possible converted into a Communist area. Communism is being taught in schools and every effort is being made to create a Soviet Socialist Republic."

The New York Times in an editorial declared in condemning the trial of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac: "The Communist dictatorship will not tolerate among the masses any influence it cannot digest and use for its nutriment. It will acknowledge no control over men's minds other than its own."

Again the New York Times declared editorially: "The Croat prelate's trial and conviction violates Yugoslavia's pledge to the United Nations to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

In resigning as Yugoslav consul in New Orleans Basil S. Rusovitch declared: "I no longer feel that I can belong to such a mockery of government. . . . My decision was prompted by the unjust trial and execution of Gen. Draza Mihailovitch, the killing of American pilots over Yugoslavia, and finally the infamous trial of Archbishop Stepinac, an innocent man, beloved in Yugoslavia."

The quotations could go on indefinitely, but brief as they are, they emphasize the infamous character of the man and the regime we now are asked to help keep in power.

As indicative of the outraged feelings of our countrymen with regard to the wanton killing by Yugoslav flyers of our airmen who were forced off their course by bad weather I quote from the New York Times of Tuesday, September 10, 1946, the refusal of members of the International Longshoremen's Associa-

tion, A. F. of L., to continue loading relief supplies aboard a ship bound for Yugoslavia. The president of the longshoremen's association, Joseph P. Ryan, declared at that time that no members of the union would load any ships with relief supplies for Yugoslavia, "until proper action was taken against those who were responsible for shooting down our planes in Yugoslavia, which caused the death of our airmen."

It is interesting also to note the authenticated reports that UNRRA vehicles were used by Yugoslav Communist youth groups to carry out their program of intimidation against religious groups in their country.

As further evidence of the type of injustices dealt out by Tito to his own subjects I have just been advised by a well-informed citizen of Maryland, that her aged aunt and uncle in Yugoslavia have had to serve 30 days each in jail because they were unable to furnish the Yugoslav Government with their quota of grain.

They could not raise their normal amount of grain because of the drought. Tito's agents refused to accept such an explanation even at the very time that their government was appealing to Washington for increased assistance because of the very drought which had prevented these poor people from meeting their commitments to the government.

I am informed likewise that this is not the only incident of its kind—rather the practice was general of requiring the poor farmers to serve time, pay fines, or give up their cows and other stock in lieu of their allotted quota of grain.

In the face of all these facts I cannot in good conscience vote to supply money exacted from the American taxpayers to a nation which is committed to communism and therefore to the destruction of freedom and liberty throughout the world.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD tomorrow an explanation of my vote against the bill providing aid for Yugoslavia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 209, Calendar 258, and I ask the clerk to state the joint resolution by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say that if there is no serious objection to the joint resolution—and I understand that there is not—we may pass it yet this evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has not yet been put.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely moved that the Senate proceed to consider the Senate Joint Resolution 209.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I stated earlier to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that I should like to have him withhold the request for the consideration of the joint resolution until some Senators who were particularly interested in it could be present in the Chamber. They are now present. Therefore, so far as the minority leader is concerned, there is no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that my motion be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, after line 7, to strike out down to the end of the bill, as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (3) (b) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any housing accommodations the construction of which was completed after March 31, 1948;"

(b) Subsection (4) of section 2 of such act is repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the maximum rent chargeable for any housing accommodations which on or before June 24, 1950, were self-contained family units located in hotels (as defined by regulations issued by the Administrator) or which now are such self-contained family units located in hotels shall be (1) the rental rate prevailing for such accommodations on June 24, 1950, or (2) if not rented on June 24, 1950, the rental rate prevailing for comparable housing accommodations; subject to such adjustment as may be made pursuant to sections 3 and 4.

"(7) Any additional housing accommodations, created by conversion after March 31, 1948, and any housing accommodations created by conversion resulting in additional self-contained family units after May 1, 1949, shall continue to be housing accommodations subject to maximum rent ceilings and minimum service standards: *Provided*, That the rent first charged by contract between the landlord and tenant for additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948, or conversions resulting in additional self-contained family units created after May 1, 1949, shall be deemed to be the maximum rent ceiling until the Administrator shall determine an appropriate rent for the same. In making this determination the Administrator may consider costs of materials and labor used in bringing such housing accommodations into existence, and he may issue any necessary regulations and general orders to effectuate the administration of the above provisions."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if Senators desire to discuss the District of Columbia rent control joint resolution, I have no objection to postponing its further consideration until tomorrow. I made the suggestion a moment ago that

we might conclude consideration of the joint resolution tonight, in view of the fact that the Senator from West Virginia understood, after discussions with various Senators, that there was a probability that we might pass it tonight. I am not trying to hurry Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that there are some Senators who would like to say a word briefly, and that there will be no opposition to the joint resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the sole purpose of the joint resolution is to extend the present rent-control law of the District of Columbia until the 28th day of February. It was unanimously approved by the District Committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Exactly what does the joint resolution do?

Mr. NEELY. It merely extends the law enacted during the last session of Congress until the 28th day of February.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, it deals with rent control.

Mr. NEELY. For the District of Columbia only.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the joint resolution to extend until the 28th day of February Federal rent control for the District of Columbia change in any way whatever the law under which rent controls are being administered in the District today?

Mr. NEELY. Not even to the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator well knows, the Senator from Washington voted against the present rent-control law for the District of Columbia.

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. CAIN. I therefore feel constrained to vote against the measure which is now the pending business. However, the Senator from Washington has no intention of arguing the question at this time, in view of what the Senator from West Virginia has just said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how long would rent control be extended under the joint resolution?

Mr. NEELY. Until the 28th day of February. However, there is an amendment, offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to extend control in the District until the 31st day of March in conformity with the general law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEELY. There is another amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", it is

proposed to strike out "February 28," and insert in lieu thereof "March 31."

Mr. NEELY. I move the adoption of that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered? If not, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 209) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45-1601 (b)), is hereby amended by striking out "January 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1951."

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the steering committee of the majority has discussed the question of the assignment of committee memberships to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. We have agreed temporarily to assign both Senators to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] will take the same two positions our former colleague, Senator Graham, occupied, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] will take the same two positions the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Withers, our former colleague, occupied.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That Mr. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, one word before the Chair puts the order before the Senate. It is definitely understood by members of the steering committee on the majority side, as well as the two Senators who are receiving these assignments, that the assignments are temporary only, and that the new steering committee which will be named in January will then reconsider the assignments, because it could be possible that older Members, who have seniority rights, may make request for these positions. I merely state that for the RECORD so that the Senators who are receiving the appointments will be under no misapprehension as to the position of the steering committee of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

The order was considered and agreed to.

PREVENTION OF CORPORATIONS FROM ACQUIRING ANOTHER CORPORATION BY MEANS OF ACQUISITION OF ITS ASSETS

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2734, Calendar No. 1777, an act to amend an act entitled

"An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Illinois had yielded the floor, and the Chair recognized the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill being taken up for consideration, so long as it does not jeopardize my rights to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, many Members have left the floor. The Senator from Illinois has now moved that a bill be taken up for consideration. I am in favor of the bill and I think it should be considered. I doubt if there is going to be any controversy about the bill. Why cannot it be made the unfinished business, and a vote be taken on it tomorrow when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the bill made the unfinished business. If any Senator should object tomorrow, I shall be glad to have the vote by which it was made the unfinished business reconsidered.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think objection will be made then, but it is too late now to obtain a quorum in an endeavor to pass the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. It is not my purpose to have the bill passed today. My purpose is merely to have the bill taken up and made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2734. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2734) to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

PROPOSAL NO COMMITMENTS BE MADE WITH BRITAIN WHICH ARE NOT SUBJECT TO SENATE REVIEW IN TREATY FORM

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 371 I have been very much encouraged by the wholesome acclaim which it is receiving in many quarters. It is crystal clear from the praise it is receiving, that the people of America are alert to the dangers which confront them and are prepared to demand of their Government a full and complete accounting of the Nation's needs, particularly as those needs are to be affected in the future by commitments abroad.

In the Thursday issue—December 7—of the New York World-Telegram, there appeared an editorial entitled "The People's Voice," which was both timely and ably written.

In the light of the fact that we of the Senate of the United States will shortly be given the opportunity to support Senate Resolution 371 I cannot recommend too strongly a careful reading of this editorial on the part of every single Member of this body. That it may be made immediately available for that purpose, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

A resolution introduced by 20 Republican Senators cautions President Truman to undertake no commitments with Britain which are not subject to Senate review in treaty form. This is a proper assertion of the Senate's rights to a voice in the conduct of foreign relations.

During World War II President Roosevelt drifted into the bad habit of negotiating with other governments on a personal basis in a manner certainly never contemplated by the Constitution. He not only neglected to seek the advice and consent of the Senate, but he also often bypassed his own State Department as well.

The agreements made at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam included political commitments which were in no sense essential to conduct of the war and were clear evasions of the Senate's right to share the treaty-making power with the President.

This secret diplomacy has continued to operate since the war, to the practical exclusion of Congress, particularly in the Far East.

Senator CAIN, of Washington, one of the sponsors of the resolution, has asked for an immediate balance sheet showing what contributions of manpower and resources are to be made by our Allies to the common defense effort. He urges the rearming of Germany and Japan, and the inclusion of Turkey, Greece, Spain, and, if possible, Sweden, in the North Atlantic Pact.

Most of these things suggest themselves to the average citizen. We are losing a war. Strong measures must be taken to avert catastrophe.

We may be dealing with a question of life or death and in a representative democracy the people have a right to know what is going on. Then, if they are not satisfied with the measures being taken, they can suggest alternatives.

If the President expects to have public confidence, he must take the people into his confidence and conduct our international relations in the manner provided by the supreme law of the land.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss a matter which is of great importance.

The current issue of Fortune magazine contains an article entitled "Battle of the St. Lawrence" by Mr. Freeman Lincoln.

In publishing this story, Fortune has rendered a real service to the country and has shown courage and independence in the best tradition of a free press.

I commend this article to my colleagues as an excellent and accurate presentation of the case for the St. Lawrence seaway.

It points out a fact which many supporters of the St. Lawrence development have known for a long time—that the eastern railroads and utilities have been primarily responsible for the delay and

the obstruction in developing this greatest all North American resource.

The source of this obstruction centers with certain financial and utility interests in a few eastern cities, principally Boston, Baltimore, and New York.

It does not suffice to point out to these interests that they would not be adversely affected by the development of the St. Lawrence Basin.

They are simply afraid of any change in the economic development of northeastern United States and Canada and their fears prompt them to resort to almost any means in their program of obstruction.

This article in Fortune magazine, which I wish that all Members of Congress would read, points out clearly the stake which the American people have in the development not only of our own resources but of Canadian resources as well.

I come from a State that is a next door neighbor to Canada.

We in Vermont have a keen appreciation of the importance of Canada to the welfare and security of the United States.

The international developments of the last few days have demonstrated clearly that when fighting is to be done and when material is needed for the defense of a free world, the North American Continent in the final analysis must supply the means.

A strong Canada is essential to the safety of our own country.

Mr. President, in the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, there is today 9,000,000 horsepower of electricity going to waste. Two million of this horsepower belongs to the United States and 7,000,000 to Canada.

This 9,000,000 horsepower of electricity now going to waste is the equivalent of the human labor of 135,000,000 Chinese coolies.

If our boys are to fight in the Far East or anywhere else in the world, they are going to need those God-given horsepower behind them back home.

Canada and northeastern United States are desperately short of electrical energy needed for defense purposes.

A few days ago, limitations were put upon the use of copper because of inadequate supply.

Shortages of sulfur are beginning to appear also.

In my State of Vermont, there are enormous deposits of copper, but the production today is restricted to 8,000,000 pounds a year, and the byproducts of sulfur and iron to be found in the waste from the mine cannot be recovered at all because electrical energy is not available.

Yet, Mr. President, these great deposits of minerals so essential to the security of America are figuratively within a stone's throw of the millions of horsepower going to waste on the St. Lawrence River.

A few days ago, our Government contracted with the Aluminum Co. of America for a large amount of aluminum to be produced at the Alcoa plant at Massena, N. Y. This is the site of the contemplated Canadian-American dam on the St. Lawrence River. The power to

produce this aluminum must be produced outside the area and transmitted several hundred miles to the aluminum plant at Massena.

In its contract with Alcoa, the Government provides that all the cost of electrical energy above 5 mills per kilowatt-hour will be added to the contract price of the aluminum. Since it requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum, this means that the product of the Alcoa Massena plant will cost the United States not less than 5 to 6 cents a pound above the contract price because the development of the power in the St. Lawrence River has been blocked.

We have in Vermont, also, large deposits of asbestos—another strategic material—and are today supplying 8 percent of the Nation's needs. The other 92 percent is imported.

There is no question but that the development of an adequate supply of low-cost power on the St. Lawrence would add immensely to our national security through enabling us to produce greater quantities of critical materials.

No less critical than the power shortage in northeastern United States and Canada is the desperate need for the improvement of navigation on the St. Lawrence River.

The great Midwest steel industry is threatened today because of the rapid depletion of high-grade iron ore; yet the almost unlimited quantities of high-grade ore discovered in Labrador could be made available to the steel plants of Buffalo, Cleveland, Gary, Chicago, and other Great Lakes steel centers if we were able to transport this ore up the St. Lawrence River to where it is needed.

Unless a new source of iron ore is made available, the midwest industries and agriculture will have to pay much higher prices for steel in the future, while the industry itself will be driven to the sea coast, where it will be exposed to enemy action of all kinds in the event of war.

Nor can we depend on offshore sources of supply of iron ore at all in case of a war emergency.

We shall need the St. Lawrence seaway to keep our supply lines protected from enemy action.

Furthermore, Canada will be our main reliance not only for iron ore, but for titanium, uranium, nickel, and many other products needed to manufacture the implements of defense.

For 5 years since World War II, we have poured billions upon billions of dollars into Western Europe and the Far East to build power plants and navigation works on the Rhone, the Rhine, and other rivers, and to build factories and industrial plants for other countries all over the world. Some of my friends who oppose the St. Lawrence have strongly supported such expenditures.

But, in the final analysis, we will find that when sacrifices are to be made and fighting is to be done and material is to be supplied, we will have to do the job largely with Canadian help.

I call upon my colleagues in this Senate to reconsider their opposition to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Law-

rence waterway; and I call upon the financial and utility interests of our eastern seaboard to brush aside the mist which has obscured their vision, to forget their self-interest, and to support the needs of their country in this crucial hour.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Holmes Baldrige, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Attorney General; and Leonard R. Carpenter, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada, vice Edward M. Ranson, resigned.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Albert H. Kleffman, of Hibbing, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 35, with headquarters at Minneapolis, Minn., in place of Viena P. Johnson; and

H. Tucker Gratz, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, that nomination is to be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee is holding hearings on the nomination. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sidney H. Browne, of New Jersey, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On a previous day objection was made to that nomination.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, all objection to this nomination has been withdrawn, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that objection has been withdrawn—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the information I have. If it is not correct, I should not want the nomination confirmed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that the objection is withdrawn and that the nomination will not be reported to the White House until two more executive sessions have been had, anyway, I raise no objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is perfectly agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BUREAU OF SHIPS

Rear Adm. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Allen E. Alman	Lawrence C. Lander III
Jack H. Anderson	Edwin A. McLean
Robert T. Billington	Bruce R. McCullough
Robert W. Blodgett	Charles D. Mendenhall
Robert L. Boonstra	Russell H. Miles, Jr.
Daniel M. Branigan	Albert C. Mitchell
Frank S. Dennis	James W. Murray
Gerald W. Fauth, Jr.	Loren A. Norden
Kenneth Fox	Maurice T. Ross
Robert N. Gray	Harry M. Sumner
Arthur S. Grenell	Russell W. VanDore,
William A. Henshaw	Jr.
Albert M. Hunt	Leonard T. Weinstein
Donald L. Keach	Clinton C. Williams

The following-named (naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 5th day of June 1951:

Richard G. Gresla	Duane C. Neuchterlein
William S. Gripman	Floyd O. Stroup

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Nancy J. Ardif	Lorraine Kraff
Margaret L. Bristol	Mary L. McCarty
Elizabeth E. Bryan	Fran McKee
Allyne Burns	Patricia E. J. Moore
Margaret Caldwell	Norma F. Parlin
Marian A. Campbell	Mary C. Pettit
Dorothy I. Clark	Catherine L. Rutherford
Dorothy J. Cralle	
Gladys D. Duffy	Mary F. Saunders
Marie K. Elsen	Anne P. Smith
Lauraine A. Freethy	Margaret N. Spangler
Norma J. Gray	Mary E. Sturges
Betty J. Grimes	Faith E. Walters
Dolores L. Hanan	Mary E. Wood
Betty L. Harrah	

Mary S. Read, woman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To the grade of captain:

MEDICAL CORPS

Armstrong, Theodore H.
Austin, Theodore R.
Bennett, Thomas W.
Blood, Russell H.
Brown, John J.
Callaway, Raymond R.
Carmody, Robert F.
Davis, George H.
Eberhart, John J.
Flannery, John L.
Hantover, Matthew J.
Hoxie, Derrick A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Boundy, Charles M.
Carlson, Arnold J.
DeWitt, John C.
Graves, Harry C.
Herlihy, Thomas C.
Keithley, Charles L.
Kinzie, Frederick A.
Kretz, Charles H., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Bates, Ralph
Broesamle, Kenneth M.
Brown, Stanley W.
Canon, Rush L.
Crowe, Walter W.
Daniel, Lewis H.
Dempsey, James J.
Denen, Harry E.
Faubion, Bernard H.
Flaherty, John J.
Fowler, William M.
Frechette, Arthur R.
Holubek, Edward J.
Jeffreys, Frank E.
Kasper, Stephen T.
Koepke, Reimers D.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bishop, Roy E.
Martin, Alvo O.

To the grade of commander:

MEDICAL CORPS

Balkus, Vincent A.
Connor, Joseph J.
Errion, Arthur R.
Florence, Quentin J.
McMahon, Francis J.
Rieder, John J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Aldrich, John K.
Algire, Kent D.
Ball, Stuart M.
Barnett, Austin H., Jr.
Batchelder, Joseph H.
Blackman, Harold H.
Bloxxom, Elliott
Brown, Richard G.
Cain, Thomas C., Jr.
Callison, Gordon M.
Clark, Robert L., Jr.
Coleman, Fred
Cone, Daniel G.
Conner, Perry C.
Covell, Leon C., Jr.
Cross, Sydney E.
Desrosier, Arthur E.
Disher, Robert C.
Dollard, John T.
Eicher, Ronald
Ellis, William D.
Fowler, Marion V.
Fraser, Oliver W., Jr.
Freeborn, Stanley B., Jr.
Granston, Robert W.
Gregory, Robert J.
Harris, Virgil J., Jr.
Hartzell, Ivan C.

McComish, Daniel R.
McCrone, Andrew M.
Nettles, Jack E.
Nielsen, William C.
North, William J.
O'Leary, John P.
Paist, John B., Jr.
Parker, James W.
Parker, Stanley D.
Pollich, Gardiner T.
Porter, Ross A.
Quinn, Charles M., Jr.
Rapp, William A., Jr.
Raymond, Carl A., Jr.
Rice, Earl G., Jr.
Rieseberg, Robert W.
Rieve, Roland
Rollings, Phillip A.
Ross, William H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barnett, Thomas E.
Cocke, Thomas P.
Cooke, Frederick A. F.
Forbess, Ordle E.
Herring, Ingram L.
McLellan, Waldron M.
Merdinger, Charles J.
Neumann, Arthur C.
Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Buckingham, Herbert Jones, Glyn W.
Hewitt, Fenelon D., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Bernard, Damon E.
Brandon, William C., Jr.
Carney, Bruce H.
Collins, Robert S.
Combs, Oscar A.
Couvillon, Wade E., Jr.
Crolius, William E., Jr.
Dobson, David P.
Felcyn, Walter V.
Gallagher, Walter N.
Gargiulo, Edward A. H.
Graves, Raymond J.
Grysbeck, Joseph R.
Gullett, William I.
Hill, David A.
Hodge, Ferris G.
Jakubs, Stanley

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Boles, Claude L.
Chambers, Francis W., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Bernatitus, Ann A.
Richards, Erma A.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To the grade of captain:

MEDICAL CORPS

Feldman, Samuel R.
Lentz, Edmund T.
Porterfield, Marvin H.

To the grade of commander:

MEDICAL CORPS

Clein, Norman W.
DeLaney, Allen Y.
Kinsey, Jack L.
Meadows, Henry H., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bacon, John F.
Betterton, Rexford L.
Bouque, Roy L.
Burrage, Leonard F. III
Curry, Frederick C.
Ellison, James F.
Fenske, Theodore H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Benson, James I.
Lawlor, Jerome N.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ehrlicher, Gordian V.
Faye, Edwin N., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Hughes, John J. K.
Turner, William E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Siegel, Jacob

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sidney H. Browne, of New Jersey, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God, our Father, we have entered upon a new day challenged by tasks which are far beyond our own wisdom and strength and far larger than all party differences. Give us now a clearer vision of high and helpful things that we may do together.

We pray that Thou wilt make us more radiantly sure of Thyself and may we not lose the sense of Thy presence as we face our duties and responsibilities.

Thou knowest how frequently our minds and hearts are assailed with moods of doubt and despair, of futility and frustration. May we never accept the verdict of these low moments or take counsel with our fears.

Help us to affirm more earnestly the great divine certainties. Show us how we may have our life oriented in Thee and find the secret of peace for ourselves and the whole world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 8, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be excused as conferee on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) entitled "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended"; and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] be appointed in his stead.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) entitled "Joint resolution to continue for a temporary

period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended."

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, the same to become effective immediately.

With good wishes, I am,
Respectfully,

F. ETEL CARLYLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 879) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That F. ETEL CARLYLE, of North Carolina, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspapers report retail food prices jumped 2 percent in the last 2 weeks of November.

These newspapers quote administration officials as saying they are powerless to do anything about rocketing retail food prices because of a provision in the Defense Production Act which says price ceilings on food must reflect parity prices to farmers.

What attempts have these Government officials made to determine whether prices paid by consumers should reflect parity prices to farmers; whether there is an unconscionable price spread between the farmer-producer and the consumer?

If, as stated, 14 major farm products still are selling below parity, then who is gouging who?

Let it be remembered that Alan Valentine, President Truman's Economic Stabilization Administrator, is also a director of the Freeport Sulphur Co. which recently boosted the price of that war essential commodity 22 percent.

It is about time Government officials quit flimflaming the public and display the courage and intelligence to deal with the facts of life or resign and get out.

DISMANTLING OF GERMAN STEEL PLANTS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before and I am going to continue to speak, I am afraid, on the question of the dismantling of the steel plants in Germany. I have here a report which has just been published in the New York Times, which can scarcely be accused of being in any way pro-German. They criticize very severely the dismantling of a plant at Salzgitter, where both aluminum and steel have been made for years. This plant produced over 400,000 tons of steel before the end of the war. It is now dismantled, and produces 19,000 tons. Unemployment is waxing heavier and heavier in this region. We, the American taxpayers, are having to feed these people and take care of these unemployed. They are now sending 3,000 of their children on what are known as free holidays into the Russian zone. These children are returning to their embittered parents fully indoctrinated with the Communist philosophy.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include the remarks I made last evening at a dinner given in honor of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of our distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] whose beautiful book on Constantino Brumidi, artist of the Capitol, called the Michelangelo of the Capitol, goes into the book stores today; and I further ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last evening to attend a dinner at the National Democratic Women's Club honoring Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, the talented and very charming wife of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], whose beautiful book on Constantino Brumidi goes into the book stores today.

There were present many distinguished people, including, of course, Senator and Mrs. McFarland, of Arizona; Congressman and Mrs. Patten, and Mrs. Wiley, president of the Chevy Chase Penwomen's League of which Dr. Murdock is a member. The wife of the Italian Ambassador was present in his absence in Italy and spoke delightfully. The wife of the air attaché, Signora Cigerza accompanied Signora Tarchiani.

Fourteen years of consecrated research on Mrs. Murdock's part have resulted in a most beautiful book which preserves for our generation and for generations yet unborn a record of this man who came to this country in the middle of the last century a political refugee, and of his works.

It is to Dr. Murdock that we owe the discovery of the grave of the man whose artistic genius and passionate devotion to the land of his adoption filled our Capitol Building with beauty. You will

recall that we appropriated \$200 to mark this grave.

Mr. Speaker, there are to be found in this volume unbelievably beautiful reproductions of examples of Brumidi's work which should make us aware that we have taken all too much for granted the beauty on these walls put there by the man who is called the Michelangelo of the Capitol.

Under unanimous consent granted me by this body, I am placing in the Appendix of the Record the few words I was privileged to speak last evening.

COMMUNISM IN ILLINOIS

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, apparently communism is not dead in the great State of Illinois. I hold in my hand a piece of Communist propaganda, issued by the Communist Party of Illinois, at 208 North Wells Street, Chicago, advocating to our young men in the State of Illinois, especially those in our great universities, that they refuse to be drafted and refuse to fight in the present war. This piece of literature says, among other things: "Is it not obvious that American leaders are wasting American lives to support another Chiang Kai-shek?" This literature is being circulated by the Communist Party through the Communist Party at the University of Chicago, and is going to the University of Illinois, Bradley University, Northwestern, and also the Chicago University. In 1949 when the Republicans were in control of the senate in the State of Illinois, an antisubversive committee was set up to investigate communism in the University of Chicago, and other universities and colleges within the State. This committee was headed by Senator Paul W. Broyles. The appropriation allotted to the committee was meager, and while investigators for the Broyles committee had a great deal of previous experience in investigating communism, yet the pressure by the Communist Party and its supporters in the legislature against the investigation made it impossible for this committee to effectively perform its function. On top of that, young Communists from the University of Chicago came to Springfield and picketed the committee during its attempt to ferret out instructors and students who were subversive in our State schools. These pickets were able to obtain the sympathy of a large segment of the Illinois press and radio news commentators. As a result of the tremendous opposition to the investigation, it failed to accomplish its purpose. Upon the convening of the Eighty-second Congress, I shall ask the Un-American Activities Committee to make a complete investigation of communism in the State of Illinois.

Chicago, and its largest institution of higher learning, the University of Chicago, has been a hotbed of communism for many years. It is high time that an objective study and report should be

made of communism in the State of Illinois and the extent of its influence in Illinois, as well as throughout the Nation.

HOW TO STOP HIGHER TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress: A word to the wise is sufficient. If you want to stop taxing, remember "no giving, little lending, and less spending."

THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFTON ALEXANDER WOODRUM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1950, the Honorable Clifton Alexander Woodrum departed this life, and the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation lost one of its most distinguished public servants. The passing of Clifton Alexander Woodrum brought deep sorrow to his many friends. His readiness at all times to listen to the problems of others and give freely of kindly advice and assistance have endeared him to a host of friends who mourn his loss.

Born in Roanoke, Va., on April 27, 1887, he was the son of Robert H. and Anna T. Woodrum. He was educated in the public schools of Roanoke, studied law at Washington and Lee University, and was licensed to practice in Roanoke on June 19, 1908. In 1917 he was elected Commonwealth's attorney for the city of Roanoke, and served in that capacity until August 1919, when he was unanimously chosen judge of the Hustings court for the city of Roanoke. He resigned from the bench on April 10, 1922, to become a candidate for Congress for the Sixth District of Virginia. He was successful in his candidacy and held his seat in this body until he resigned on September 1, 1945, to become the president of the American Plant Food Council, which position he occupied at the time of his death.

As a capable and illustrious legislator he was a vital force in shaping the trend of legislation in our country, and throughout his long term of service held high place in the respect and admiration of his colleagues. His interest and careful attention to the needs of his people have left an indelible impression on our area of Virginia such as made by few men. His sterling character and pleasing personality attracted to him a host of friends in Washington as well as throughout the State of Virginia.

I have been greatly impressed by the esteem and affection in which he is held in every hamlet of our district.

It is a great privilege and honor to have known Clifton Alexander Woodrum, and to have been one of his many friends. I feel a sincere sense of indebtedness to him for his kindness and assistance to me upon taking the seat in this body for the Sixth District of Virginia which he filled with great distinction for over 22 years.

It is with deep sorrow and a feeling of keen personal loss that I make this tribute to the memory of our distinguished friend, and offer sincere sympathy to his gracious and devoted wife, to his son, Clifton Alexander Woodrum, Jr., and to his daughter, Martha Anne Woodrum.

Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1950, the board of directors of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., adopted the following in memoriam resolution in honor of the late Clifton A. Woodrum:

Whereas the Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum served with distinction and honor as the first president of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., until his death October 6, 1950; and

Whereas he established himself in the respect and affection of his State and Nation for his courageous and effective championing of the principles upon which our private enterprise system is founded; and

Whereas he rendered notable and effective service in creating a better understanding of the fertilizer industry, its contribution to agriculture and its relation to the national economy as a whole; and

Whereas as an acknowledged leader in Congress for 23 years he was constructive, practical, and farsighted in his approach to national affairs, always consistent with common sense in encouraging private initiative and discouraging regimentation; and

Whereas by his character and devotion to duty, his courage of conviction, his integrity of purpose and his love of mankind, he established himself in the esteem of all who knew him and was singularly effective as a spokesman for business without being unmindful of the well-being of his fellow citizens; and

Whereas his untimely death removes from government and business a leader of influence for a better, stronger Nation, a friend with practical understanding of human weaknesses and appreciation for human fortitude: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors, in session this 6th day of December 1950, unanimously record their respect, appreciation, and admiration for the late Clifton A. Woodrum, and recognize his effective leadership in the affairs of state and in the field of industry and particularly his manifold contributions in strengthening American business as the best safeguard of American democratic institutions, American initiative, and American strength; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the family of the deceased; that a copy be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting; that a copy be incorporated in the 1951 Journal of Proceedings of the American Plant Food Council; and that a copy be sent to each of the fertilizer trade magazines.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the mere mention of the name "Cliff Woodrum" brings to us who knew him memories of a sweet character, a noble-minded gentleman, a great legislator, and a great American.

As I am speaking now I can see him during the years we served together in the House of Representatives, in conversation with him, on the floor of the House, and particularly the able and brilliant manner in which he handled legislation entrusted to his care. I can see him during the dark days preceding World War II, fighting in committees and in the well of the House, for the passage of legislation of vital importance to the preservation of our country. I can

see that gray hair of his, that fine noble countenance. It seems he is with us today.

He voluntarily retired from the National House of Representatives, and the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON], who has announced his death, succeeded him.

On one occasion I went into his district to speak for him. Mrs. McCormack and I shall never forget the hospitality we received from him and the good people of his district on that occasion.

It is difficult to express in words the thoughts that I have in relation to Cliff Woodrum. In his passing Virginia has lost one of its outstanding sons and the Nation one of its outstanding citizens. I join with my colleagues in expressing to the Virginia delegation our keen regret as well as our sympathy in the passing of our distinguished late friend and colleague, and in particular to Mrs. Woodrum and her daughter and son I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we all heard with a deep sense of loss and regret of the death of our former colleague, Cliff Woodrum, of Roanoke, Va.

I had the honor to serve with Cliff Woodrum in this House for many years. Had he died 10 years ago it would have been a day of solemn mourning for this House and for the Nation. He occupied a most important position when he was a Member of the House. His record is written in numerous debates on vital matters that occurred during his time of service. For a long period he was chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Committee.

In any important matters which came up in the House during those years Cliff Woodrum was foremost in their consideration. He has written a fine record here in this House and in the country at large. I am sure we all feel a deep sense of loss and a deep sense of sympathy for his splendid family in the death of this man in the prime of life.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sense of sympathy in the loss of one of the finest legislators with whom I have associated since I have been in Congress. Cliff Woodrum to me was the ideal Member of the House of Representatives; he was honorable, capable, and most sincere in everything that he did. Could I emulate and follow the example of but one legislator with whom I have ever served, that Member I have said many times, would be Cliff Woodrum. He was my ideal Member of Congress. I feel that we lost a great friend, and the country a great man when Cliff Woodrum was carried to the Great Beyond.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia has well spoken of the great willingness of Cliff Woodrum to lend assistance and support

to those whom he might be able to help. Of that I can bear witness out of personal experience. Back in 1935 when I first came to the House, it fell to my lot to present a matter on the floor of the House that involved tremendous personal interest to certain people in my district. At the conclusion of my remarks a gentleman whom I did not know—I had not been here long enough to know anyone—made a splendid argument in support of the position I had taken, and that position prevailed. Subsequently I learned that the gentleman who had come to my assistance—one of the newest, youngest Members of the House—was Cliff Woodrum, one of the great, outstanding Members of the House. He did not know me, but took it upon himself, out of the greatness of his heart, to help me in what for me, as a complete beginner here, was a rather trying and difficult situation. Subsequent to that time I came to know Cliff Woodrum very, very well.

I think if any one thing could be said of him and stressed more than others it was that while he was great enough and able enough to deal with the tremendous responsibilities that came to him as one of the outstanding men of responsibility in the House, he never lost the common touch; he never lost that great solicitude for the minor things with which he might be able to help. That, I say, was a great tribute.

Cliff Woodrum was one of the most able debaters to whom I have ever listened. While he was strong, with it all he was gentle. I never knew him to take an undue or an unfair advantage of anyone, either because he might have been better informed on the matter before the House or because he might have had a little greater capacity or ability in presentation. That also was a great attribute.

I could say many other things, Mr. Speaker, but I have said only these few things to add my word of sympathy to his family and to wish for them the comfort that may be theirs in the sure knowledge that those of us here who knew Cliff Woodrum join with them in their great sorrow.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to serve in the House with our distinguished former colleague, Cliff Woodrum. However, I did have the pleasure of seeing him and being associated with him occasionally during the past several years. I learned to respect him and to understand the high esteem and the admiration in which he was held by those who knew him intimately.

I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of Cliff Woodrum and desire to express my sympathy to his family.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, our late former colleague, my friend, Cliff Woodrum, has passed away, but he left to us all a record of achievement seldom equaled by men who have chosen the tedious, uncertain, and quite frequently thankless job of public service. Those

who had the honor of serving with him in the world's greatest deliberative body, the United States House of Representatives, will never forget this great Virginian.

But for the accident of a name, Cliff Woodrum would have been, when he decided to retire from politics, the chairman of the powerful Committee on Appropriations; I am informed that he and the now distinguished chairman, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, came to Congress at the same time and that Mr. CANNON was elected chairman because his name came first on the alphabet of the members, thereby giving him the seniority by which all chairmen are chosen.

Mr. Woodrum never failed to work in the closest harmony and cooperation with his chairman. In the darkest days of World War II I can see Cliff Woodrum now carrying the banner of his committee against uncertain and frequent odds on the floor of the House. Cliff Woodrum's life was replete with acts of helping his fellows. He was always part and parcel of the struggle for his brother's cause. He never stopped long enough to reflect that the uncertain hand would some day beckon him home. He did not take time to rest from the trials of his arduous undertakings. He died with his boots on. He died in the midst of his labor to bring greater blessings to the man who tills the soil. Mr. Speaker, the workman lost one of his greatest benefactors when Cliff Woodrum "turned again home."

Cliff Woodrum was too busy to realize that—

Such a tide as moving seems asleep,

Too full for sound and foam,

When that which came from out the boundless deep

Turns again home.

Mr. Speaker, truly Cliff Woodrum has embarked on that bourn from which no traveler returns, but his legacy to Americans yet unborn, as well as those now living, will never be tarnished by the troth or everlasting moments of time. Though he has gone down the way of permanent sleep the Nation will be a greater Nation, the world will be a greater world, because he lived and worked for his fellow man.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and especially the members from Virginia in expressing my feeling of personal loss upon the passing of Cliff Woodrum. When I first came to this body a number of years ago, Cliff Woodrum was one of the first men I met and learned to love and admire. Whenever he took the floor of the House, Members on both sides of the aisle listened in rapt attention to what he had to say. He was one of the most distinguished Members of this body, he was one of the most convincing debaters who ever took the floor of the House of Representatives, he was a capable legislator and a very distinguished man. He was greatly admired and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. A few years ago I was privileged

to deliver an address in his home city of Roanoke, Va. From the people who knew him best and whom he served so ably in this body, one learned the deep faith, confidence, and affection in which he was held by them. Virginia has lost one of her great sons and the Nation one of its illustrious statesmen. I join the delegation from Virginia and the Members of this House in expressing my sense of personal loss and my sympathy to his widow and to his family.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I shall always count it as one of my great privileges that, when I was assigned to the Appropriations Committee, my first subcommittee was the Committee on Independent Offices, then headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Cliff Woodrum. I sat at his feet for several years. Everyone who has ever served on that committee will agree with me, I know, when I say it was not only a privilege, it was a great training to be there.

This man was one of the great men of the country in our time. I have always thought it was one of the unfortunate quirks of history not merely that Cliff Woodrum did not have an opportunity to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but also that he did not have the opportunity to become President of the United States. He had the capacity for being a great President.

A few years ago, and some time after he had left the House of Representatives, Mr. Woodrum responded to an invitation to make the annual memorial address for the Elks Lodge in Rapid City, S. Dak., in my district. Accepting that invitation—I never knew quite why—he spent 2 days with us and made a great many friends in my part of the country. They were impressed by his spirit, his personality, and his great capacity. We shall always hold him in reverence. Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously shocked by Cliff Woodrum's death. I am glad to have this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to his memory.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, in describing Cliff Woodrum, I said he was a man that had the stature, the mentality, the personality of a great statesman, and that he was of the stature and timber that really belonged in the White House and would grace the White House. I firmly believed that at that time and I still believe it. In Cliff Woodrum's death the Nation has lost one of the greatest of the great.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Cliff Woodrum during his entire public career. When he was Commonwealth's attorney in the city of Roanoke, I was counsel for the State tax commission, and as such collaborated with him in the trial of tax cases which arose in his city. When he was elevated to the bench, I tried several important cases before him. I had the pleasure of serving with him in the House and suc-

ceeded him as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Cliff Woodrum devoted the best years of his life to the service of his State and Nation. His conspicuous ability, untiring energy, striking appearance, pleasing personality, and intense patriotism made him one of the outstanding leaders of this body. When he spoke on the floor of the House, he commanded attention and his remarks always carried conviction.

The Commonwealth of Virginia is proud of his record and mourns his untimely death. Today we join with his former colleagues in paying tribute to this truly great Virginia gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentlemen who have just spoken in everything they have said about my friend, Cliff Woodrum.

I met him the first day he came to Congress, and was intimately associated with him during all the years that he was a Member of this House. I do not hesitate to say that Virginia never sent a worthier son to the Congress of the United States than Cliff Woodrum.

We had a clash at one time on the floor of this House, the result of which has always stuck in my mind as a manifestation of that character that distinguished him as one of the outstanding Members of the Congress. In 1938 he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. We had up one of those large spending bills. Everyone knew of my intense interest in rural electrification. I offered an amendment for the first \$100,000,000 for that purpose. It rather took Mr. Woodrum by surprise, and he opposed it. We finally adopted the amendment by seven votes in the Committee of the Whole, and then adopted it on the floor of the House over his protest.

That fall, after he had gone home, traveled over his district, he came back, and in his attitude manifested that high degree of magnanimity that characterized his entire career. He came to me and said, "John, I want to apologize to you. I was wrong in opposing your rural electrification amendment. Nothing else that has ever been done has inspired so much hope and enthusiasm among the farmers of Virginia as your amendment providing those funds for rural electrification."

I bring this incident to your attention to show you the magnanimity of this magnificent servant, this great man, this great American whose passing we all mourn today.

God grant that he may greet the coming of another age of youth and usefulness in another radiant Easter beyond the gates of night.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The curtain of death has been drawn on a noble and illustrious life and the work and career of a great man ends. It was my pleasure to know Mr. Woodrum only a short while but I formed of him an opinion that

placed him among the great men of this Nation.

I will remember that, when Mr. Woodrum gave notice that he was going to retire from the legislative halls, our Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, gave one of the finest tributes to Mr. Woodrum I ever heard. He placed him then along with Jefferson, Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and other illustrious statesmen.

The last time I saw Mr. Woodrum he appeared on the stage with me in my district to dedicate the Pompano Air Field. With him was his daughter, who is an aviatrix and piloted him to this airfield.

At that time he made a wonderful speech emphasizing the importance aviation played in World War II and how much more important it would be in any future conflict.

He was held in the highest esteem and admiration by his fellow citizens in Roanoke, as well as the entire State, and this high regard for him found expression in naming the airport at Roanoke after him and in his honor. This airport is now known as the Woodrum Air Field.

He was a grand and renowned American and rendered invaluable services both in private and public life.

In the nobility and immensity of his works, Cliff Woodrum lives on—and truly it can be said of him:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Cliff Woodrum was a real Virginian, and better than that could be said of no man.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, for I feel irresistibly impelled to say that I join fervently in every tribute that has been paid to Cliff Woodrum.

The great State of Virginia has always been distinguished for the character and devotion of the men who have been sent by her to the Congress. Never has Virginia, or any other State sent as a Member of either House a more able, honorable, diligent, or effective servant than Cliff Woodrum. He not only was the Representative of his district, but also of State and Nation. We are grateful for the proud record the "Mother of Presidents" has made in the sons and daughters she has bred and shared their fruitful public services with the National Government. There never has been a man more worthy of the highest honor than our friend whom we "have loved long since and lost awhile."

Every heart who knew him is bowed in grief and sympathy with the bereaved family.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The late Clifton Alexander Woodrum was elected a Member of the House of Representatives for 12 consecutive terms and served with signed ability from March 4, 1923, until his resignation on December 31, 1945, to become president of the American Plant Food Council, Inc., in which capacity he was serving at the time of his death some days ago.

Cliff Woodrum, shortly after he came to the House, became a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He was unusually well informed as to the fiscal affairs of the Government. He was painstaking and thorough in preparing and presenting appropriation bill to the House.

Cliff Woodrum had a good personality. He possessed an especially attractive voice. He was not only an able legislator but he was possessed of unusual executive ability. He presided well and most satisfactorily when called to the chair to preside in the Committee of the Whole, as was often the case. He was one of the most accomplished presiding officers within my recollection.

Cliff Woodrum was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He had a most successful career. There was genuine regret in the House when he resigned. I gladly join in tribute to his services as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the expressions so sincerely stated this morning indicate the high esteem and affection in which our former Member, Clifton Woodrum, was held by this body. We of Virginia feel highly honored to have been represented by a man of such high character and a man of his ability.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point on the life and services of the late Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, Clifton A. Woodrum was a native Virginian. He was born in Roanoke, Roanoke County. There he maintained his residence for all of the 63 years he lived. He attended the public schools of Roanoke. He received a degree from the Medical College of Virginia in pharmacy. He graduated from Washington and Lee University in law. He practiced law in Roanoke. He served as Commonwealth Attorney and judge of the Hustings court of Roanoke. He was elected to Congress in 1922. He served 11 consecutive terms, resigning in 1945 to become president of the American Plant Food Council.

While my association with Judge Woodrum was limited, I held him in high esteem. He was able, honest, and courageous. He was a man of sterling character. He possessed a magnetic personality. He had, in a marked degree, the characteristics of a great leader. While charitable with his enemies, he never compromised with wrong.

As a servant of his people and an exponent of progressive democracy, he was

an influential Member of the Congress. He served as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Coming to Congress the same year that Chairman CLARENCE CANNON came, he was the ranking member when Mr. CANNON became chairman. His work on the committee was outstanding. His services during the war years were indispensable to the prosecution of the war.

Judge Woodrum was a fluent and convincing speaker. Because of his talents in debate, he wielded great influence. Constituents of mine still talk of great orations he delivered on many occasions in my district. They were masterpieces in rhetoric and logic.

He was a man among men, not a dreamer in the shadows. He was always out in front leading the parade for a better America. Virginia, America, and the world are richer and better for his having lived. His life was a blessing to mankind.

To his family I say, you should be happy, not at his passing, but for the rich heritage that he bequeathed. He was deeply devoted to you.

"THEY BROUGHT THEIR WOUNDED WITH THEM"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Sunday morning I heard a part of one of the most thrilling newscasts I have heard in my whole life. It was the news that the marines and the Third Division rescue column had joined up and had made the 30 miles into Hungnam. The short sentences ran something like this:

The marines came out proud. They were tired and hollow-eyed from 12 days of fighting but they brought their dead and wounded with them. They left behind no equipment that would be of benefit to the enemy. They carried with them what they would need for future fighting.

Mr. Speaker, those beleaguered men had made one of the great stands of all time. They had fought in the most severe weather ever encountered by United States troops in combat. They had been outnumbered seven to one. They were surrounded on all sides. They had to replace a bridge under fire. They had to fight their way down a winding, icy road in a narrow canyon with the enemy firing from protected heights and bunkers. They had to knock out road blocks and go through superior numbers. But they came through.

Mr. Speaker, there are many famous words in the history of American valor. I shall not attempt to recount them in this limited time. Many words, some complimentary, a few uncomplimentary, have been spoken and written about the United States Marine Corps—but while there remains such a thing as honor among men, and as long as hearts respond to the dignity of man and value

the life of one human soul, let these words be remembered:

The marines came out proud—they brought their wounded with them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a personal letter from Mr. Clayton. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Clayton has given me permission to put the letter in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two speeches on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the Jewish Community in Charleston, S. C., and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the one by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Tobias, come first, and that of Admiral Lewis L. Strauss come second.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Courier-Journal.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. Gross) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each a letter from a constituent.

Mr. NELSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a soldier constituent.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include some articles.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter which was sent to all Members of the House regarding the so-called 21-day rule.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in

two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from editorials.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a portion of a letter.

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT, 1947

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3182)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'December 31, 1950' in each place it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1951.'"

"SEC. 2. Section 204 (j) (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That as used in this Act the term "resolution" shall not be construed to be limited to ordinances or other legislative acts, and any resolution heretofore adopted by any local governing body is here-

by declared to be effective for the purpose of this section 204 (j) (3) or section 204 (f) (1), whether or not such resolution was legislative in character; and no suit or action shall be brought under section 205 of this Act, or any other provision of law, on the basis of any administrative decision or the decision of any court that the resolution described in this Act must be a legislative act."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

B. R. MAYBANK,
GLEN TAYLOR,
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
JOHN W. BRICKER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution provided for a 2 months' extension in the automatic decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The House amendment provided for a 3 months' extension of this provision. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment on this point.

The Senate joint resolution also contained a provision clarifying the provisions of the existing law with respect to the action of local governing bodies in removing and continuing rent control. A recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit interpreted the provisions relating to decontrol by local bodies to mean that where under local law a different procedure is prescribed for legislative action by the local governing body than that prescribed for other action, a decontrol resolution must be adopted in accordance with the procedure prescribed for legislative action. The amendment is designed to make it clear that, for the purpose of removing rent controls or continuing them, resolutions heretofore or hereafter adopted which comply in all other respects with applicable local law are valid even though the procedure prescribed for legislative action was not followed. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the Senate joint resolution on this point.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the act extending rent control. It is a unanimous report of the conferees.

The amendment of the Senate provided that the act of the governing body of the municipality or local subdivision was not limited to ordinances or other

legislative acts, and any resolution heretofore adopted by any local governing body is declared to be effective. This applied not only from the effective date of the act but was retroactive and makes action decontrolling the cities valid if done in conformity with the provisions of this act. The House concurred in this amendment.

The Senate bill provided that the Rent Control Act shall be effective until February 28, 1951; the House bill provided an extension of 90 days, or 3 months, to March 31 of next year. The Senate receded and concurred in the House amendment. So, under the act rent control is extended until March 31 of next year. The House conferees felt that it was essential that the act be extended for 90 days in order that it might be sufficiently considered by the House. We all know that a new Congress takes a long time to organize; there will be vacancies to be filled on the Ways and Means Committee, and, after those vacancies are filled, the Ways and Means Committee will proceed to fill vacancies on various committees. Those committees cannot function until they have been reported to the House and the action of the Ways and Means Committee has been confirmed by this body. We felt therefore that it was absolutely essential that the extension should continue for 3 months in order that proper consideration might be given to this question of the continuation of rent control.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The same thing, of course, applies to our Republican friends' action on the part of the Republican committee on committees in relation to their members.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman is correct.

It was absolutely essential, and we felt that we made a very good agreement in this respect. We accepted the Senate amendment. The conferees on the part of the Senate in turn accepted the House amendment. We think this is substantially the bill as passed by the House, notwithstanding the agreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will also give an opportunity to about 40 legislatures in this country to consider rent-control legislation, and the States will also be given additional time, and the communities likewise, who want to comply or act under the law.

Mr. SPENCE. That is true, and the act as extended continues every right to municipalities to extend the act until June 30, 1951, if they desire to do so, or to discontinue rent control by a resolution of the governing body. Some cities have taken action that probably this might affect. The city of Los Angeles, which may be decontrolled by the passage of this amendment, can repeal the ordinances it has passed which have not yet become effective by reason of court

action, and has it within its power to continue rent control in that city if it so desires. We have left it up to the cities; we have placed it back with local self-government, just where it should be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the conferees have done the best job they could and that they brought in a report which represents their best thinking on the subject. I wish, however, to direct the attention of the membership to what we do if we adopt this conference report. We override a decision of the court of appeals so that the people in the far West, particularly the people in the city of Los Angeles, will be deprived by their right to review anything that their local governing body has done or may do. In other words, as you probably know, if the local governing body of most localities throughout the West adopt a resolution of a legislative character or setting up policy, as these rent laws do, the people have a right within 30 days to demand a referendum and then determine for themselves whether that should be the law or not.

Under the provision which is written into the bill at this time you deprive those people of that right. You will now permit any local council to deprive the people in the community of the right to a referendum and to review what their city council or local governing body may do. If we agree to this conference report we are going to validate the decontrol action of the City Council of Los Angeles, and possibly of other places, contrary to the will of their people who seek to pass upon it by referendum.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman oppose this conference report?

Mr. MULTER. I am constrained to oppose the conference report because of that provision which was defeated on the floor of the House last week. We had this identical provision submitted to us by way of amendment last week and the House rejected it. It is now put into the bill by the conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Does the gentleman think it is desirable that we get the additional 30 days for consideration by the House?

Mr. MULTER. I am quite in agreement it is important that we have 90 days rather than 60 days.

Mr. SPENCE. Does not the gentleman think that was very important?

Mr. MULTER. I heartily agree it is of the utmost importance.

Mr. SPENCE. The only way we could get it was to do a little trading with the Senate.

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate that. I know the chairman of the Committee on

Banking and Currency and the other conferees did the very best they could. I still feel, however, that we have a very, very bad provision in this bill. The least we should do is alert the people of those communities so that they can get busy at once and, if necessary, recall their council members or the members of their local boards or otherwise try to do their will and get the control they need. When this bill is signed by the President, those places will be decontrolled and will not again be controlled unless we change existing law next year.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman's position is he is opposed to the extension of rent control because of the particular amendment that was added by the Senate which does not provide for the 30 days for any referendum covering a city council's legislative act?

Mr. MULTER. I am in favor of extending rent control until we can bring in here a bill which will extend rent control where it is needed, if it is needed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But the gentleman opposes this conference report?

Mr. MULTER. I am opposed to this provision.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then the gentleman is opposing extension of rent control?

Mr. MULTER. I am not opposing extension of rent control. I am directing your attention to the fact that by this provision you are depriving your constituents of the right to a referendum on a question of the utmost importance to them.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I was very much opposed to this bill. I may have a peculiar idea of the duties of conferees; however, I signed the conference report under the belief that I was representing the House of Representatives and was morally bound to see that the position of the House was presented to the conference and that everything was done to protect the House provisions of the bill, although I am still opposed personally to the 90-day extension. That matter has now been adjudicated so that it becomes simply a question, on the one hand, whether the automatic decontrols should be continued for 60 or 90 days after December 31, 1950. The Senate had a provision for 60 days and we had a provision for 90 days. But, on the other hand, I thought that the controlling thing which bothered us more than anything else was the provision of law which authorized a municipality to decontrol by resolution. It was very clearly the intent of the Congress when it wrote the 1950 Rent Control Act that a governing body of a municipality might decontrol or continue control by passing a simple resolution. We provided in that act that they might decontrol by passing a resolution or by a referendum. Now the governing body chose the method of decontrol. It could either pass a resolution or it could provide for a referendum as to whether there would be decontrol. In some eight-hundred-odd cases the governing body adopted a resolution

which was honored by the Expediter and action was taken to decontrol those areas in which a resolution was adopted.

The matter went to the circuit court of appeals here in the District of Columbia and the circuit court of appeals picked out of clear air this issue as to whether we did not mean "ordinance" when we said "resolution." The matter had not been presented in any of the briefs submitted by either side of the controversy in the case. As I understand, the court on its own initiative framed the issue on whether we did not mean that a resolution included an ordinance. In other words, we had provided, and it was to be the intention to provide for administrative action only by the passage of a simple resolution, but the circuit court of appeals said that we intended that the resolution should be a legislative act which would have the full force and effect of an ordinance. So the Senate clarified that language by the provisions which are contained in the report.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In order to remove any doubts in the matter I would like to ask the gentleman this question, whether the amendment added in the Senate will validate the resolutions that have been passed by some twelve hundred cities and counties in the United States, and especially in the one passed in the city of Los Angeles, and remove the necessity of the Supreme Court acting further on the question that was presented to them on an appeal from the Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would assume that because of the action now being taken by the Congress in this respect that the matter now before the Supreme Court in the case of the City of Los Angeles against Tighe Woods, and others, has been completely settled and that there is nothing before the Supreme Court for adjudication in that case. But, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court in that case, the language that we have written into the law in the so-called Cain amendment provides that the term "resolution" as used in the act shall not be construed to be limited to ordinances or other legislative acts. It means, therefore, that the resolution referred to in the act is something different than an ordinance or other legislative acts. Then the language goes on to say: "Whether or not such resolution was legislative in character" and, further, that "no suit or action shall be brought under section 205 of the act or any other provision of law on the basis of any administrative decision or the decision of any court that the resolution described in this act must be a legislative act." So, notwithstanding any decision of the Supreme Court or the circuit court of appeals, that stands.

We have provided that the term "resolution" does not mean a legislative act. In direct answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that under the terms of this amendment it is our intention to

validate, and the language actually does validate, every resolution which has been passed by any governing body decontrolling or which might be passed by any Government body continuing controls, including the Los Angeles case.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is it the gentleman's opinion that by the adoption of this conference report it is mandatory for Mr. Tighe Woods to sign the resolution adopted by the City Council of Los Angeles?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Absolutely. That was our intention to begin with. We seek to clarify his position in this matter. Hereafter, as on all of these occasions in the past, this will be considered a mandate to Mr. Woods that he must issue an order upon the passage of a resolution by the governing body of the city, notwithstanding any position which he might take to the contrary in respect to the merits or equities or facts in the case.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY FROM AIR-MAIL PAY

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9184) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9184, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'Hara].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota: On page 3, strike out subparagraph (2), lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH to the text sought to be stricken by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'Hara]: On page 3, line 5, strike out beginning with the word "shall" down through the period in line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall in no event exceed the reasonable and necessary cost to the air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient management, of the mail transportation services rendered or to be rendered, including a fair return."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brought before the House last Wednesday this legislation, all of us in the beginning stated the legislation was controversial, that there was disagreement with reference to its

various provisions. We worked rather diligently, some of you are aware, Wednesday here in the Committee, and the Committee rose late in the day. After that occurred it became the objective of those who are interested in finding a common meeting ground in regard to the provisions of this bill to hold additional meetings to see what we could work out which might be more acceptable to more of the Members who wanted to see something done. Accordingly we met from about 9:30 last Thursday morning until about 6 o'clock. Incidentally, we had with us representatives of the CAB, of the Post Office Department, and one member of the Hoover Commission when the Commission was in being, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

I can sincerely say to the members of the committee here assembled that a great effort was made to narrow the area of disagreement in regard to this important piece of legislation.

We agreed on some seven amendments. The question came up as to whether or not any Member is bound by the amendments. Of course, it has always been my contention that you do not bind Members of Congress very successfully. In the main each Member is a free agent and says what he wants to say and takes the action which he desires to take at any given moment. But I can say that as of the time we left that meeting Thursday, about 6 o'clock, there was no apparent overt disagreement on the part of any person. In my opinion we came near to getting together with reference to the seven amendments which will be offered here today to the Heselton bill. This, of course, does not mean each individual fully agrees with all which was done. The amendment I have just offered, which is one of the seven amendments, retains the cost standard which several of us said the other day was important to retain. It is a good anchor. It is the beginning, you might say, of the fundamental problem of doing this job of work well. May I say that almost to a word it is the language which the Civil Aeronautics Board wanted from the beginning. Although the language is not quite so specific as was the language we originally had in the Heselton bill, it definitely is the opinion of the authorities of the CAB that it constitutes a strong retention of the cost standard, a standard which the authorities of the CAB contended from the beginning is necessary to have in the legislation if the job is to be done well and efficiently.

As I said a moment ago it is hoped by each of us, and incidentally there were several members of the transportation subcommittee who attended the meeting all day long, and several others at least, two, who are not members of the transportation subcommittee; as I say it is hoped that we can work out this bill in such a way as to get a bill this session; yes, today. It is believed that the seven amendments to which I have referred do the job best as of this time.

It is my sincere hope that the Members of the Committee will go along with

us in our effort to bring about the adoption of these seven amendments, including the one I have just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that the interested Members here on the floor, last Wednesday, when this matter was brought before the committee, met with the members of the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the period referred to, and resolved these differences to the point that it was believed that a bill we would pass today should be passed with these amendments adopted, agreed to, virtually, by the Members who participated in this conference, and we are bringing it to the House membership now with the explanation that this does what most of us want it to do, to bring about a compromise of the issues that were involved in the debate last week.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is true. The bill is not exactly what each person who was there would like to see if he were writing his own bill, but it is about the best we can get in an effort to see that a bill is written, and at the same time undertake to get substantially that which each interested Member wanted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has again expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] who has just spoken, has given you something of the picture of our attempt to work out the differences and difficulties which exist in this bill.

This amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Texas as a perfecting amendment to my amendment to strike out this language, as he has stated, and it is agreed to by those of us who sat in on the conference on these differences. While it is not completely satisfactory to me, I am supporting the amendment, and suggest that it be adopted in lieu of my amendment to strike out the language of the bill. That is in accordance with the labor and the effort put forth and the understanding had.

Permit me to say that in my minority report, which was filed in opposition to this bill, this is one of the things which caused me great concern. I am assuming that those who were in on the conference will also support the other six amendments which the gentleman has indicated would be offered.

Let me say to you frankly, I feel that the transportation of mail should be governed by the same rates and the same language, across the board, not only for air but for rail and for vessels that are carrying mail in sea commerce. My theory on that is that it is a fair principle to have the cost element the same in all of those. We are now setting up new language and a new measuring stick which will apply only to air. How it will work out and whether it will work out fairly to the taxpayers, whether it will work out fairly to the carriers, I do not know and I do not think anyone could say. However, it illustrates the difficulty of the problem that is involved in this legislation and in matters pertaining to interstate and foreign commerce in the carriage of mail, and should have future study and consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has partly answered the question I was going to ask, which was that if all of the seven amendments are adopted, then the bill would be less objectionable to him?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is correct. It is improved some, but I wish it might be further improved.

Let me say primarily from the viewpoint of the taxpayer and the Post Office Department, the ones who pay the bill, that I think in dealing with this subject we must approach it fairly, not only to the taxpayers in what we pay out for the carrying of the mail, the payment of subsidies as well, but also that it should be fair to the various transportation systems. But I do want to repeat that the manner in which we have worked out these differences is a compromise, and I think not only should this amendment be adopted but that the other amendments as they are offered should be adopted and made a part of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows, for many years I was a member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. And a very able member.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been my observation through my years of service on that committee that it has always been the aim and purpose of the committee to bring legislation to the floor on which the committee was in substantial agreement as far as anyone could work it out, recognizing the necessities of compromise to make it fair and equitable. I want to commend the gentleman and the members on both sides of the committee who worked along in his group for the effort they have made to compromise and work out this legislation.

The bill as originally introduced provided that there should be a definite separation of subsidy from the regular mail-carrying charge. While I felt there were some serious defects in the legislation as originally reported and while I think the compromise now reached may

not perhaps be perfect, yet I think it is a fair compromise and that it is a credit to those who worked it out.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say that from the start I have completely subscribed to the theory that there should be a separation of air mail pay from subsidy. I believe that a transportation charge is one thing but that a subsidy is quite another, and that they should be separated completely.

Let me say to my colleague, also, that as he knows our committee has, in all the years I have served on it—and I am sure all the years he has served on the committee—not decided legislative matter on political issues. While there have been times when there were considerable differences in the committee, there were differences of opinion as to the merits of the legislation, never on political grounds; and that completely applies to this legislation; there has been a cross section of opinion both ways in the committee, but a cross section based on an honest difference of opinion and not on a political division in any sense of the word.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the changes made in the bill over the week end number five or six.

There is one amendment made on page 3 on the important subsection dealing with cost. Language was put in that the CAB desired. I believe it is as effective as the previous language and I think it was a good compromise.

Another amendment deals with the time in which these sections shall be put into effect. It went perhaps farther than I would have wanted, but it is not unreasonable.

On page 8 there were several changes made which I do not think are basic and which we were glad to accept.

There are two sections, however, that were discussed and amended that I believe are basic to this bill. This House, however, has a great deal to do in the closing days of this session and I therefore will not fight against the amendments; perhaps they can be perfected in the Senate, or if the bill goes over until next year they can then be discussed. One is on page 6 and deals with the allocation of air-carrier receipts and expenditures. In the original language we stated that in order to determine what the cost of carrying air mail was the air carriers would have to break down their cost into four items: Transportation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail.

The point was made that there were other categories and it was suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who was a member of the Hoover Commission, that we should not name definite categories. It was felt further by gentlemen representing the CAB that in order to determine the cost of carrying the mail these things would have to be done and there was no necessity in writing the amount. The change went a great deal further than it should have, and I think a mistake has been made.

There was another unfortunate change made. It is basic and a correction should

be made if this bill goes to the Senate. Under the bill as we originally planned it, we stated that subsidies should be available to all those planes that have a certificate of operation. During the conference it was suggested that subsidies should be given only to those planes which had a certificate to carry airmail.

Now you give subsidies for three reasons: First, to help develop the airline industry; second, to help the Nation's commerce; and third, to help the Nation's defense. If we give subsidies only to those who happen to have a certificate to carry airmail, we deny subsidies to many other lines that do not carry mail, but who are important to the national defense. For instance, the Slick Airline in Texas has a large fleet of cargo carriers. If they were made eligible for a subsidy, perhaps they could perfect those cargo carriers so that if there were a national emergency they could be used to carry military personnel or cargo.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know the gentleman recognizes that the purpose of this bill is to separate airmail compensation from subsidies. Of course, in connection with these other carriers, while it may or may not be advisable to subsidize them, there is no question of any separation of subsidy because they receive no mail.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it true that a subsidy is given not only for carrying mail but for national defense and to develop the commerce of the Nation? Because of national defense, should not other planes besides those that happen to have certificates to carry mail be included?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is a question which the committee has not considered as yet. This bill is for the purpose of separating compensation for carrying airmail from subsidies. Of course, that subject has not been considered by the committee and hence should not be contained in this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me as long as subsidies are based partly on defense, you should not give the subsidy to only those who have a mail contract.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman desires to introduce a bill which relates to the nonscheduled and nonairmail carrying carriers, of which there are something like 2,400, I am sure the committee will be interested in its consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman is wrong. Only 12 new airlines would be eligible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I opposed the original amendment last Wednesday, I should say for the purpose of the RECORD that this new amendment, in my opinion, is far more satisfactory. It does retain in the bill the essential cost element which is basic to any satisfactory separation.

There are, as others have said, five additional amendments. It is not my

purpose to discuss each of them; however, I would like to join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in what he has said about the probable necessity sometime in the immediate future for considering the wisdom of including other carriers than those who are authorized by certificate to transport mail. We all know that the armed services, particularly the Air Force, is very much concerned about a sound transport system. Certainly we, by our action, do not want to take any step that will be harmful in that respect.

The sixth amendment, which strikes out all of subsection 3 on page 6, is one which I could not personally recommend. However, it is true that in existing law the CAB does have the power to make these allocations. That being true, although they have not done it, and because I have been assured that Mr. Rentzel has said that he believes in separation and is going to see that it is done, and particularly because I realize the practical situation which confronts us here this afternoon, I shall not oppose it. Even without that section this is a bill which in my opinion separates the airmail pay and does it on a cost basis. I think this is so because I cannot conceive of the carriers being able to comply with any order that the CAB issues unless they do allocate their receipts and their expenditures into at least four categories, and those are the four categories that are eliminated by this amendment which will be offered. From a practical point of view I think the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who was a member of the Hoover Commission, was far preferable to striking this entire section, but I will prefer that he speak for himself in terms of that suggestion.

On the whole, I think everyone who has been trying to work this very difficult and technical problem out is entitled to congratulations for what they have tried to do. I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has his doubts about one section. I share those doubts. In the over-all my feeling is definitely this: We have a chance this afternoon to pass a bill which we all agree upon in principle. It will take a long step toward separation. We should have separation by March 31, 1952. Congress will be in session between now and that time. If some of the things we are doing this afternoon are mistakes, I am sure that the committee will come back here and recommend additional legislation.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose the amendments, and I shall support the bill this afternoon.

I do want to say for the RECORD that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] well merits our thanks and appreciation. He introduced the first comprehensive airmail subsidy separation bill, H. R. 2908, on February 21, 1949, the day the Hoover Commission reported its post-office recommendations to Congress. He testified before our committee and has cooperated fully with us in this exceedingly difficult task of bringing to you an amendment upon which we would join in

recommending favorable action. Although it is true that neither he nor I can recommend certain of the amendments and voted against them while the effort was being made to work out the best possible compromise, it must be a source of real satisfaction to him to have so much of the vitally important points of his original suggestions now in this bill before us.

I can and do say that with this bill passed we are in an excellent position to see to it that the details are worked out and that there is no reason why we should not have the actual costs of carrying the air mail in the open by March 31, 1952. Then only those subsidies which can be justified as required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense bill be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 9184 was before the House last week and we had before us a substitute bill, I made the suggestion that the measure be sent to, or taken back by, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further consideration in an endeavor to work out some sort of an agreed bill that would carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. That action was taken by the House, with the consent of the Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in charge of the bill and the Democratic and Republican leadership of the House. Later the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was courteous enough to extend me an invitation to appear before it, and to permit me to present some suggested amendments for consideration of the committee. Those suggested amendments, I should state, had been prepared by a number of us who had been interested in the Hoover Commission's work.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say on behalf of the group that met that the suggestions made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] were most valuable in helping us get together.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate your statement very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to concur in the statement just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. The gentleman who is now speaking, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, was a Member of our committee for a number of years, a very active one at the time he was on the committee, and familiar with some of the problems we have. Out of that experience he has given to us very valuable information and has helped the committee get together and come together and resolve the issues as we have

presented them here today. We express our appreciation to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. The Interstate Commerce Committee, in its wisdom, did accept some of those amendments, at least in meaning and in content, if not in exact words, and has brought before the House an amended bill which has been agreed to by all the members of that committee.

I find the bill as amended, is in line with the Hoover Commission's recommendations, and will accomplish the purpose of those recommendations.

I can find just one thing about the bill with which I might personally differ and about which the Hoover Commission, as such, might have something to say. I refer to page 6. As mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] we had suggested a portion of section 3 be retained in the new bill, down to the word "rendered" in line 22, to have the Civil Aeronautics Board, as a matter of instruction and policy, prescribe standards for keeping airline accounts and records. However, I understand the committee has been assured by the spokesman for and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board that such statutory language is entirely unnecessary, inasmuch as the Board now has that authority under present law. In other words, that there is no need for repeating in this act the authority the Board already has under present law, and that the Civil Aeronautics Board will do exactly that which would be required if this section were incorporated in the bill now before us.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Permit me to say that the Civil Aeronautics Act is much more broad and helpful to them than the language contained in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that is right. I believe we discussed in your committee the fact that the bill as originally brought to the House did restrict the Board to a certain extent. The amendments I have suggested, and which were prepared by our group, would have eliminated some of those restrictions, and would have left the authority with the Board practically the same as the Board contends it now has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand further that your committee does have statements from the Civil Aeronautics Board, and pledges or promises, whatever you might wish to call them, that the Board will follow faithfully the intent and purpose of the proposed amendment, and your committee therefore feels it is not necessary to write the amendment into the law. That being the case, and with that understanding, and notwithstanding the previous recommen-

dation of those who worked on the Hoover Commission, I feel that we should accept this bill in order, as members of the committee have pointed out, that we may get action at this session of Congress. I believe the measure the committee has reported out and brought here is one all of us can accept and support, to the great benefit of all concerned, especially the taxpaying public.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Personally I am glad to see the gentleman express himself on these various proposals, particularly the amendment to which he is addressing himself now. I appreciate the fact that he is willing to accept the committee action and go along. I believe it would be more advantageous to have it in this form than in the language the gentleman discussed with us a few days ago.

I might say to the gentleman further, to clarify this issue in his own mind, the Big Four case, which is being considered now, is having brought into it this particular point as an issue. The counsel to the Board advised us that they are in this particular and specific case putting into effect these various categories to which the gentleman is referring at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

In closing, may I reiterate that I believe this bill is in such shape each and every one of us can support it without any reservations.

May I also compliment the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having met a rather difficult problem ably and fairly, and very well. All the members of that committee are entitled to great commendation for having worked so diligently on this particular legislation, have compromised their differences and come up with what I believe is a good bill.

I hope it will receive the unanimous vote of this body.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in view of my statement and the conference which was had, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and accept the substitute in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for a number of years past, and previous to the formation of the so-called Hoover Commission, I have been very much interested in the subject of separation of air-mail pay from subsidy monies. The action of the committee today in bringing out the bill entitled "Separation of subsidy from air-mail pay" as now amended and weakened is at least a step in the right direction. I am not as hopeful as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], that we are going to get this legislation enacted by both bodies during the present Congress. I feel it is highly important, however, that this House should right

now demonstrate its intention and its eagerness that the taxpayer should know exactly how much of his tax dollar is being paid the airlines for carrying his mail, and how much is in the form of outright subsidy.

In my humble estimation, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of the subcommittee handling funds for the Civil Aeronautics Board, the airlines have been permitted to delay this needed reform for entirely too long. But be that as it may, I am going to go along on the compromise which was arrived at by the members of this committee on Thursday last after many, many hours of discussion. There are a number of matters which have been added to and deleted from the bill by way of amendments which will now be offered here on the floor by the committee with which I could not at all agree.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has manifested great interest in this problem for some time. The gentleman from New York joined in the conferences we had on this and helped to work out these differences so that we are able to come before the Membership of the House as we are today with these different points which have been at issue resolved.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, my ideas did not prevail. I was outvoted on every issue except insertion of UPU, rates.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I commend the gentleman from New York for the position he has taken. I believe that he has had the same fears about this measure as I have had and expressed. However, I feel rather certain if the Civil Aeronautics Board will do that which they have pledged to the committee they will do, and that is put in this accounting system, they can and will properly separate and show what is paid for mail transportation and what is paid for subsidy and thus the whole purpose of the Hoover Commission recommendation will be accomplished.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio to that extent, but I go a bit further. For instance, in this bill as amended there is no provision for allocation of costs. I think that such allocation was a vital part of the need for the original bill. I felt that the original bill introduced by the distinguished gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HESELTON] was a good bill which did not require amendment and that to take out the allocation of costs between the four categories mentioned on page 6 of the bill, in my humble estimation is not the thing to do.

I also felt and so stated in the conference that the Postmaster General should be required to appear as a party at every hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board and should in behalf of the public be required to submit a state-

ment of the rates recommended by him as being fair and reasonable for delivery of the mail.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the Postmaster has that authority.

Mr. ROONEY. The law does not now require him to do so. However, all legislation is the result of compromise, and feeling that it is best to get the House of Representatives of this closing Eighty-first Congress on record as favoring the general principle that air-mail pay and subsidy money should and must be separated, I shall go along.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We appreciate it very much. I also favored the four categories, originally, but the Civil Aeronautics Board pointed out to me that naming four categories would restrict, and that in making this division they might want to divide it into more than four categories.

Mr. ROONEY. When you serve for a number of years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations you do not pay too much attention to what many of these agencies tell you. They never like to assume additional responsibility but delight in the receipt of greater power.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with that statement of the gentleman also, but I do not limit it to just serving on the Committee of Appropriations where you learn that. You learn it from serving on other committees as well. But I believe there is something to the argument that when you write into the law a restriction of four categories you bar other categories. You seemingly set up only four instead of possibly others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with what the gentleman has said about eliminating the duty of the Postmaster General to recommend on all rates, but will not the gentleman agree with me that there is another factor, aside from the reasons so ably stated by him, that we have the Civil Aeronautics Board in a quasi-judicial position, you have the airlines coming in, with able counsel and able accountants, thoroughly presenting their case; but there is one great group of people who would not be represented unless the Postmaster General did present the public's case. I hope the Postmaster General will accept that responsibility if he has that power now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW:

Page 3, line 19, strike out "by an air carrier", and on page 3, line 21, strike out "include a statement of" and insert in lieu thereof "state and support in detail."

And on page 3, line 25, and page 4, line 1, strike out "(A) a statement of the rates recommended by him as being fair and reasonable, and (B)."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments which has been agreed to by the group that has been described. This amendment removes the requirement that the Postmaster General state the rates which he considers fair and reasonable in every case where a petition is filed for the fixing or changing of rates. The Post Office Department has stated that to require it to suggest a rate in all cases would be to require it to build up a staff of rate experts which would unnecessarily duplicate the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board. When the Postmaster General is the petitioner, however, he still would be required to state and support the rates he recommends.

There is no argument against this amendment, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time, not with any thought of opposing the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], but to emphasize the desire upon the part of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that his amendment and the others that have been adopted by the subcommittee will be adopted by the House.

In this connection I would like to further emphasize to the Members of the House that notwithstanding there has been some controversy between the members of the committee with respect to certain language in the bill, there has never been any controversy or difference of opinion between them with respect to the approval of fundamental purpose of this bill. I believe the membership of the House is interested in the fundamental purpose of the bill; namely, to separate air-mail compensation from subsidy in order that there may be a clear understanding with respect to what is paid for each.

The amendments that are offered as a result of the further study given to controversial questions have been arrived at as a result of a very sincere effort on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and those interested Members of the House who have met with it. These amendments do not in any way change the underlying purpose of the bill, which, as I have stated, is to separate air-mail pay and subsidy. The controversy, based upon differing viewpoints, has arisen entirely through an effort to adopt proper language with reference to the formula of cost. The language of the amendments which have been agreed upon, as has been said already, have not in each case met entirely the views of each individual; however, the amendments that are presented to you do represent compromise language arrived at after very

serious consideration of all the differing viewpoints that have been expressed.

The fundamental purpose has been that whatever formula was used or by whatever words it was expressed, it was intended that there should be a fair and reasonable rate allowed for carrying mail and whatever might be paid as a subsidy was to be separately considered.

Undoubtedly there will be some questions to arise in the future that may require further consideration by the committee, but at the present moment with the light the committee has and after the fullest discussion and consideration of the differing viewpoints, this bill as amended has been recommended to the House with the thought that it will maintain the basic principle and purpose of the bill. I believe that it is the basic principle of separation that the average Member of the House is interested in, and I trust the House will have confidence in the recommendations of the committee at this time, and, be assured of the intention of the committee to make certain that as experience comes to us in the future, that it will give consideration to any changes that may seem necessary to make the law just and equitable from the standpoint of the airlines and the taxpayers as well.

It is the desire of the committee that this bill be adopted at this session of the Congress. I think it will be a great achievement for this House and the Congress to adopt this legislation which comes to us as a result of the study that has been made by the Hoover Commission.

In addition to the recommendation of the Hoover Commission there have been many other studies that have been made, including studies by the Brookings Institute. All of these studies have resulted in the same conclusion, namely, that there should be a separation between air-mail compensation and subsidies. This bill will accomplish that very thing, and I am hopeful that the House will have confidence in what the committee has done in this respect and that it will give its approval to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 4, line 12, strike out "a certificated air carrier" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "any air carrier holding a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, obviously the work of the members of the subcommittee, together with the able assistance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] was very helpful and has brought forth some good results. I want to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and the other members of the committee for the very fine, able, and constructive manner, as well as for the conscientious and determined efforts of coming to-

gether and to work out some of these points at issue in a manner acceptable to us under the circumstances.

When I offered the substitute last week it will be recalled there were some four or five specific objections I had to the bill reported by the committee. One was that it extended subsidies to all certificated carriers. Another was the cost-standard provision contained in the bill reported by the committee. Another was the cost allocation of the various categories of service which would have brought about a complete change in bookkeeping and a complete revision in the accounting system of the air carriers and would make it difficult for the Civil Aeronautics Board to administer.

Then there was a further objection I had with reference to the international carriers and the complications that would result in connection with the proposed bill. We have tried to resolve these points of difference. We have done a fairly substantial job, in my opinion. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] said a moment ago, none of us are 100 percent satisfied, but we do feel that in the give-and-take proposition as good a job as could be hoped for has been accomplished. Personally, I am not satisfied at all with the effects or the results, so far as the international carriers' situation is concerned. I am not satisfied altogether about what the result may be in connection with the UPU rates and their effect on our carriers and just what their situation may be competitively with other international or foreign air carriers. Nevertheless, this is a part of the work we did as we come together and bring it to you in a manner that we believe will be for the best interest.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I fully subscribe to what he has just said. I confess that on the subject of the international carriage of mail and UPU rates my own mind is somewhat in a state of confusion. I hear one view of some in the Post Office Department, another by the CAB, and still another by representatives of the airlines. I have not been able to satisfy myself about the situation. I do not say any of these gentlemen have misstated the facts. The trouble is, in my opinion, we have not always gotten the best information and the most thorough information that I would like to have on the subject, before we legislate on such an important matter.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the reason I said it is not altogether clear to me what the ultimate effect of this will be insofar as international carriers are concerned and the competitive position; nevertheless I do feel it is a matter that can be cleared up later and I am sure it will be.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. With reference to the particular amendment the gentleman has offered, over the week-end I

had occasion to look over the brief of the Seaboard Airline's case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. The situation that bothers me is the cutting of this back to the certificated mail carriers. This particular line is the only unsubsidized freight service in the international field and they want to go forward with their work. They are carrying more freight now than any other single line, and I think it would be a great mistake for us to arbitrarily cut them out from possible consideration. I am sure the gentleman feels, knowing him and his ability and his fairness, that if situations like that develop, the gentleman would be glad to join in presenting a further solution.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. As has been so well said already, we did not have hearings on that particular point of issue before our committee. If it is a question that is to be taken up and considered, I will join with the other members of the committee at an appropriate and convenient time to take it up and give it most thorough consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said a moment ago, this is a bill to separate subsidy from air-mail pay; that is all. It is not a bill to extend subsidy. That is the way I understand it. This amendment that I propose here limits the provisions of this bill just as it was intended, that is, to the separation of air-mail pay from subsidy payments by the Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is not this amendment which the gentleman is offering now identical with the amendment recommended by the gentleman from Ohio after his discussion with the members of the task force of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. HARRIS. Identical. The amendment limits the class of carriers which may apply for subsidy payments to those carriers holding mail certificates. This limitation conforms to existing law. Under the bill as reported any certificated air carrier may apply for subsidy. The class of air carriers which may apply for subsidy should not be broadened beyond present law until this question is more fully explored. This is in accordance with the agreement and understanding of all of the Members present last week when we had our sessions.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be adopted and the other amendments we agreed to will be adopted and that this bill as amended will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: Page 5, beginning in line 22, strike out "to make, with respect to the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending March 31, 1952, or with respect to any part thereof," and insert in lieu thereof "to make."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment removes the limitation on the period during which the Board will have power to make temporary subsidy payments. The need to make temporary subsidy payments will not be limited to the period immediately following the separation between rates and subsidy. Situations may arise at any time in the future where the difficulty of determining final subsidy payments makes it necessary to have authority to make temporary subsidy payments pending final determination as to the subsidy payments which should be made.

Mr. Chairman, this is another recommendation of the group which I mentioned a moment ago, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 6, line 10, strike out "on or after July 1, 1951," and insert in lieu thereof "after March 31, 1952."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments that have been referred to. It simply gives the Civil Aeronautics Board nine additional months to do this job of separating mail pay from subsidy. One of the reasons is that the bill was reported last August, and some 3 or 4 months have elapsed since that time. It is necessary that the Board have additional time within which to do this job. This amendment provides that.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. As I heard the amendment read, it was to strike out the language "on or after July 1" and substitute "after March 31." Is that what the gentleman intended to do?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is the language of the amendment. The words that are to be placed in the bill are "after March 31, 1952."

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman intends to eliminate "on or after July 1"?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The amendment as offered is in a form which I think is correct. As I understand it, the intent is to have the separation take effect beginning with the second calendar quarter of 1952. This amendment could have been drafted to read "on or after April 1, 1952." The same result is reached by the pending amendment, which reads "after March 31, 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

ALLOCATION OF AIR CARRIER RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 3. Section 407 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) By inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and
(2) By inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) On or before July 1, 1951, and from time to time thereafter, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, after notice and hearing, prescribe standards by which air carriers, in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda, shall allocate receipts from, and expenditures for, the air transportation services rendered by them among the following four categories: Transportation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail. From and after July 1, 1951, it shall be unlawful for any air carrier, in keeping any account, record, or memorandum (other than any additional account, record, or memorandum kept pursuant to the proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection), to allocate any receipt from, or expenditure for, any air transportation service it renders in any manner other than a manner which conforms to the standards prescribed pursuant to this paragraph."

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 206 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "civil aeronautics" a comma and the following: "including data relative to the mail payments and subsidy payments, both in the aggregate and on an individual basis, made under this act with a separate analysis of the bases upon which each such mail payment and each such subsidy payments was provided."

STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to make studies in connection with any of the provisions of this act. In the conduct of such studies the Board is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on of such studies by such persons or organizations as may be designated by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the chairmen of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

(b) On or before April 1, 1951, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, on the basis of a comprehensive study, render a written report to the Congress on what aggregate sums would be required during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and during each of the four succeeding fiscal years (1) to provide fair compensation for services to be rendered by air carriers in the carriage of the mails, in accordance with the provisions of section 406 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended by this act, and (2) to provide for payment of essential subsidy, in accordance with section 406 (c) of such act, as amended by this act. Such report shall include a study of the potential revenues from all forms of air traffic and of the potential economies which could be achieved in airline costs, as well as such other factors as may be pertinent to the development, with the least possible expenditures by the United States, of an efficient and economical air

transport industry to the extent and of the character and quality required for the national defense, the commerce of the United States, and the postal service.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board such sums, not to exceed \$300,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: On pages 6 and 7, strike out all of section 3, lines 11 to 25, inclusive, on page 6, and lines 1 to 7, inclusive, on page 7, and renumber the subsequent sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this was one of the controversial features of the bill which was originally before us and which has been worked out by the compromise agreement.

This amendment strikes out section 3, which provided that the Civil Aeronautics Board would prescribe standards for the allocation of air-carrier receipts and expenditures for specified categories. It has been pointed out that the Civil Aeronautics Board, under existing law, has full power to prescribe these standards; and it is apparent that the Board will have to prescribe such standards in order to achieve the separation. However, in view of the difficult nature of the problem it is believed preferable to leave to the judgment of the Board the time when these accounting changes must take place.

Mr. Chairman, it happens to be a fact that under section 407 of the Civil Aeronautics law there is very comprehensive provision for the setting up of an accounting system. It took the CAB and the airlines something like 3 years to set up that system. The regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board comprise a book of approximately 100 pages of instructions. It took thousands and I presume hundreds of thousands of dollars to set up that accounting system throughout all the airlines of the United States. It is felt that the language in the present bill would be much more restrictive than the CAB might feel in order to determine the separation of air-mail pay and subsidy.

In the minority report of this bill there is fully set out the objections of the CAB with persuasive logic, the reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

It is felt it would be far better to permit the Board to have that leeway and from such studies as they may make or their experience may show to provide for a proper system of accounting to complete the separation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Do I understand the gentleman's position to be that the Civil Aeronautics Board already and upon passage of the pending bill has the power to prescribe standards by which air carriers in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda shall allocate receipts from and expenditures for the air transportation services rendered by them, among the following four categories: Transpor-

tation of passengers and their baggage, transportation of freight, transportation of express, and transportation of mail? Does the Civil Aeronautics Board now have that authority?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have that authority now. In addition, they have much more power because it may be, if I understand the situation, that about 80 percent of the airline business is on joint rates, and they have some tremendous difficulties.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We specifically talked about this while we were in the series of meetings the other day. Would the gentleman give his impression as to what the CAB has indicated the CAB expects to do about this particular thing immediately?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is my understanding they will set up such a system, and they are now in the process of working it out. The fact of the matter is that in the so-called Big Four cases the CAB has informed us that they have learned much themselves, so far as this subject is concerned, and they will undoubtedly follow up with additional regulations which will require all of the things we want to show with reference to the separation of air-mail pay from subsidies.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not fair to state furthermore that the fact the language is not there is no evidence the Congress is not very anxious that they, insofar as possible, separate it into these four categories, or any other categories necessary to make this picture a clear picture? Certainly, it is my hope the four categories can be used. I would not want to limit the categories to four, however. If other categories are necessary, they, too, should be used.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH:

On page 8, line 4, strike out "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1952."

On page 8, strike out lines 7 and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "It estimates will be required during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment postpones for 1 year the date by which the Civil Aeronautics Board is to report to the Congress with respect to costs to the Government of air-mail pay and subsidy. One of the purposes is to give the Board more time within which to make its study in that particular connection. When it reports, it is to report for the following fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and to report for 1 year only rather than for 5 years as the bill originally provided. It is felt that this is a more practical solution to the objective which the committee was seeking by the original language.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say of course this bill is a compromise and the amendments which we have offered today are a compromise, and while perhaps none of us is satisfied, including myself, nevertheless, for the sake of getting a bill, we have gone along thus far. In no way have I personally changed the views which I expressed the other day when this bill was on the floor. I intend in the extension of my remarks to give some reasons why certain further changes should be made in this legislation before it is finally enacted into law and to that end I now ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, under authority to extend my remarks I reiterate that this bill should not be enacted into law and, in fact, no bill should be enacted until the Senate committee study of this subject has been completed and become available. However, as the House appears to be insistent upon some bill being passed now, I can say that this bill, H. R. 9184, with the amendments agreed to is in far better shape than it started out to be, and that doubtless it would have been had not an agreement on amendments been reached by our unofficial conference between differing members. The bill H. R. 9184 in its present form is not too seriously different from H. R. 9305, which we offered as a substitute except that this bill includes our air carriers in foreign commerce and certain other provisions which I shall discuss.

SEPARATION OF MAIL PAY AND SUBSIDY OF AIR CARRIERS OPERATING IN FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is the wrong time to require separation of compensatory mail pay from subsidy to our air carriers in foreign commerce and doubt that a right time will come until foreign-flag carriers do likewise. Hidden subsidy is being furnished to all international carriers, whatever flag they carry. Our own flag international carriers are privately owned. Other flag air carriers are all government owned, and as such are not required by their governments to adhere to the same rigid accounting as are ours. That is the initial disadvantage we suffer. While those governments can see the published costs of our carriers, we cannot do the same for each of the foreign-flag carriers. Therefore, by our disclosing the amount of subsidy we pay to our airlines in foreign commerce, we lay ourselves open to a subsidy war. That alone is sufficient reason to exclude our air carriers in foreign commerce from this bill.

But for sake of argument, let us assume that the separation principle is correct. We have a number of so-called national-interest air routes. I do not think it is smart to disclose those routes and their cost in terms of subsidy support, and such would be required under this bill.

But in the general case what would be the effect? Let us take the three situ-

ations that would arise. First is the case where the compensatory rate to be established turns out to be greater than the rate now agreed in the Universal Postal Union—UPU—of 6 gold francs, or \$2.86, per ton-mile in the North Atlantic. Second would be where the compensatory rate comes out equal to the UPU rate. Third is the case where the compensatory rate is less than the UPU rate.

In the first case, i. e., where the compensatory rate turns out to be greater than the UPU rate, then in that case our Post Office Department would be forced to offer our mail to foreign-flag carriers, because their rate, the UPU rate, would be cheaper. If the Post Office Department should refuse to do that, then foreign governments would have reason to claim we were discriminating against their lower-rate carriers in favor of our own higher-rate carriers. Compulsion would also come directly for budgetary reasons of the Post Office Department. At that point our carriers would lose the mail pay almost altogether and the subsidy payments would have to be increased accordingly. We would then have to pay twice—once to the foreign-flag carrier for carrying the mail and again to our own flag carriers as additional subsidy.

In the second case, that is, where the compensatory rate turns out to be equal to the UPU rate, an unlikely happenstance, our carriers would be on an equal footing with foreign-flag carriers so far as carrying the mail is concerned, but subsidy pay, if any, being disclosed unilaterally by us would open the way to charges against us on account of paying subsidy, and a subsidy rate war would ensue.

In the third case, that is, where the compensatory rate would turn out to be less than the UPU rate, then our Post Office Department, for budgetary reasons, would find it incumbent upon themselves to give all of our mail to our own carriers, instead of giving some of it to foreign-flag carriers as they do now. In that case foreign governments would doubtless retaliate by not giving any of their mail to our flag carriers as they do now, and hence our carriers as well as theirs would be flying their home-bound courses empty of mail, and that would be a loss to all concerned and require us to pay added subsidy to our flag air carriers.

Therefore, if any separation of subsidy from mail pay is to be made, it probably would be least damaging to us to establish a compensatory rate at whatever the UPU rate is at any given time, instead of going through the expensive process of trying to find a true cost. But that probably is too simple an answer to appeal to anyone.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF H. R. 8194

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous other reasons why I feel opposed to this bill at this time, but among them are the following:

First, as we are on the brink of war, this is no time to be asking either the Civil Aeronautics Board or the air carriers to divert their attention and resources to this business. At any time the National Defense Establishment may requisition a large number of planes and

crews and thus throw accounting and the rigid accounting procedures in this bill into a cocked hat.

Secondly, the bill establishes a rigid accounting of cost of service which is a part of a larger service, and no two accountants can ever agree on exactly how to separate and allocate costs on an actual-cost basis. At best, the allocations of charges must be done empirically. To write "cost," as such, into the law may require a long court procedure and final Supreme Court decision as to what cost is to mean in each case that can be brought before it.

Thirdly, while compensation for carrying the mail at determined rates becomes an obligation of the Government, that is not the case in this bill so far as subsidy payments are concerned. The bill, H. R. 8194, leaves that question up to the whim of the Congress through its appropriations for paying subsidy. If the Congress appropriates less than the Civil Aeronautics Board determines as necessary, then the CAB must reallocate the subsidy payments appropriated accordingly. This means that no airline receiving subsidy can know what subsidy it is to be paid until after the Congress has acted and the Board then has acted accordingly. It means that airlines requiring subsidy will not be able to finance their operations as no responsible banking organization or group can offer finances on such a tenuous and uncertain prospect. Hence either Government financing or outright Government ownership of subsidized airlines would eventuate necessarily.

If it is desirable to control the continued enjoyment of route certificates then this is not the way to control it. A far better way would be to empower the CAB to issue an order to an airline to appear at a hearing to show cause as to why its certificate or any route certificate should not be revoked as being no longer in the public interest and to the public convenience and necessity to continue such certificate in force. Under this bill any air carrier or any route or segment of a route can be cut off without warning merely as a result of a specific cut or even a general cut in appropriations made by the Congress. This process can eventuate into overriding even a Presidential certification order and generally bring financial chaos to the entire commercial aviation industry. The payment of subsidy to an airline should be a contractual matter and not an indirect means of canceling certificates of public convenience and necessity without notice or hearing.

Mr. Chairman, there are other objections to this bill, H. R. 8194, as amended in the House, but these or any of them that I have presented appear to me as good and sufficient reason why H. R. 8194 should not become law in these last days of the Eighty-first Congress. I hope and trust that the counterpart of our committee in the other body will agree so that we may take another look at the subject in the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a letter which the Post Office De-

partment wrote to the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, on December 7, 1950. The Postmaster General mentioned several provisions he would like to see in the bill. There have been no hearings on some of these; although the committee has great confidence in the Post Office Department, it would wish to have hearings on all the suggestions.

I simply want the RECORD to show that the letter was considered by the group of members when we met the other day. Since there were no hearings held on some of the recommendations contained in the letter, we felt that we could not act on them at this time, but in the future we shall be glad to consider those recommendations. Also I desire to include a letter dated December 7, 1950, which was written to the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN, by Hon. D. W. Rentzel.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 7, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I believe it to be of the utmost importance that I communicate to you at this time my feelings about H. R. 8184, a bill designed to accomplish the separation of the subsidy element from mail pay, now actively being considered by the House. While the Administration and the Board are on record as favoring separation legislation and while H. R. 8184 essentially accomplishes that purpose, there are nevertheless several very serious objections to some of the provisions of this bill. I shall not burden you here with a detailed statement of the objections, for they appear in a letter from the acting chairman of the Board to Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA, quoted in full on pages 18-20 of the report accompanying the bill. The views expressed in that letter were substantially the same as those expressed in response to a request by Congressman BECKWORTH several weeks previous to Congressman O'HARA's inquiry. At that time we submitted in outline form a comparison between the provisions of H. R. 8184 and the suggestions of the Board for a suitable bill, submitted by its chairman on February 15, 1950, before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We are enclosing a copy of that submission for your convenience.

The principal objections of the Board referred to above were as follows:

1. The bill extends opportunity for subsidy to carriers not now eligible by making all certificated carriers eligible.
2. The Board is not given authority to fix temporary subsidy payments pending the fixing of permanent subsidy.
3. The bill provides that the Board shall order each carrier to allocate costs and revenues between the different services, but apparently does not afford a particular carrier the opportunity for a semijudicial hearing to determine the propriety of such an order as applied to it.
4. The provisions as to the time in which the change-over should be accomplished are not clear and will result in confusion.

The objections that the Board has hitherto expressed to H. R. 8184, which objections I understand are not opposed by the administration, are the same today as they were before. It is true that by a subsequent amendment to the bill an attempt was made to cure one of these objections by giving the Board the authority to fix temporary subsidy payments for the period July 1, 1951, to March 31, 1952. This amendment, while

allowing the Board a little breathing spell in the tremendous job imposed upon it in changing over to the new scheme of determining separately service and subsidy payments, does not eliminate the essential objection. In the first place, it does not allow enough of a breathing spell. It is difficult to see how the Board will be able to fix permanent rates and subsidies within the time contemplated by the bill. The result will be that many carriers will have to operate without substantial sums obviously due them from the Government. These carriers cannot but be seriously harmed by the delay. Quite aside from transition period problems, it is essential that the Board have a continuing authority to make temporary subsidy payments. The airline industry is still in a dynamic stage and with the nature and the risks involved in its operations, crises are to be expected more frequently than in ordinary public utilities. A good example of that was the period after the recent war. It is desirable that the flexibility with respect to temporary payments that the Board has under the present act be continued.

The Board feels that the elimination of the foregoing objections, which would make H. R. 8184 more nearly comparable to the bill suggested by the Board, would result in a bill much more administratively feasible than is H. R. 8184. We therefore urge that serious consideration be given to the Board's objections to H. R. 8184.

In closing, I should like to reiterate the Board's support of separation legislation. We are actively engaged in a proceeding to establish service rates for the largest four carriers in the industry. Our staff has put in a tremendous amount of work on the case and has now reached a point where it can make significant contributions to the very difficult problem of setting up definite standards for separation of the subsidy element. The Board continues to believe, further, that separation legislation should be passed at the earliest possible moment consistent with the drafting of a bill that will better accomplish the task. It is only on the question of the adequacy of the bill now actively under consideration that the Board has serious misgivings and believes that a more satisfactory bill can be worked out. I shall hold myself ready to supply any additional information and assistance that you may consider desirable.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
Chairman.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LINEHAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] for their invaluable work last week in trying to perfect this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8184, pursuant to House Resolution 854, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY), there were—ayes 66, noes none.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter addressed to him by John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times, and an editorial from the Detroit Times; and further to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter and tabulations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BRAMBLETT for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1774. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$11,000,000 for the Selective Service System (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1775. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of October 1950, pursuant to Public Law No. 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1776. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relating to factors which may tend to affect adversely our competitive enterprise system during a period of defense mobilization, pursuant to section 708 (e) of Public Law No. 774, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1777. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Maria Tome Da Silva Lawver, file No. A-6008146 CR 25896, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Henryk Oselka, file No. A-6802109 CR 26013, requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9828. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 3183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 9890. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9891. A bill to eliminate the retroactive application of the income tax to employees of the United States working in the possessions or in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 9892. A bill to exempt from the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act sales of food for human consumption in hotels, restaurants, cafes, bars, and other establishments where the sales price of the food furnished an individual patron is more than \$1.25; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 880. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and \$350 funeral expenses to William Earle Griffin, son of Helen M. Griffin, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 9894. A bill for the relief of Thomas I. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 9895. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 9896. A bill for the relief of Elias Miltiades Jordanopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 9897. A bill for the relief of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9898. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of stillness as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear like bells at evening pealing the call of the better angels of our nature: We come seeking wide horizons around our noisy lives. Midst all the busy shuttles of legislation, as here is woven the fabric of law and order, shielding the life of our democracy and of free peoples everywhere, may we not be so enmeshed in the immediate mechanics of our solemn task as to lose sight of the total pattern shown in the mount of vision. As we have undertaken on this continent a government of, by and for the people, may we not lack the spiritual quality and a constant sense of the divine sovereignty, without which no such government can long endure.

So make us faithful ministers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. O'CONOR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 11, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9184) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.